

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 785

HE 006 462

AUTHOR Hesmith, James N., Ed.
 TITLE More for Less: Academic Planning With Faculty Without New Dollars.
 INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.; Society for Coll. and Univ. Planning, New York, N.Y.
 PUB DATE Apr 74
 NOTE 81p.; Papers presented at a conference sponsored by the Society for College and University Planning, Nordic Hills, Itasca, Illinois (April 17-19, 1974)
 AVAILABLE FROM Society for College and University Planning, 3 Washington Square Village, New York, New York 10012 (\$3.00)
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Education; Budgeting; *Conference Reports; Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; Faculty; *Higher Education; Models; Planning; Post Secondary Education; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Participation; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

The conference and the papers presented in this volume grew out of the conviction of a random group of persons who discovered, quite by chance, a shared concern: that serious consequences are falling to higher education as a result of financial procedures intended to meet the crisis of survival. It is obvious that survival and solvency are not bad. But the struggle for efficiency and financial effectiveness can all too frequently exhaust the combatants and leave them unaware of the loss of the very human values they fight to save. Papers included are titled: People Planning in Postsecondary Education; Human Resource Development in a World of Decremental Budgets; Academic Planning and Faculty Involvement; Statewide Perspectives on Planning with Faculty; The Threat of Efficiency; Planning for Quality; Role of the Faculty in Planning; Fiscal Structures and Institutional Decision Making; A New Undergraduate Model; Increasing Institutional Performance Through Faculty Development; Regional Assistance to Advance Reform in Undergraduate Education; and Institutional Self Study. (Author/PG)

ED105785

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

U.S. GOVERNMENT
PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C.
20540

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Society for Science & the Public
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER.

MORE FOR LESS:

Academic Planning with Faculty
without New Dollars

*

Papers presented at a conference sponsored by the
Society for College and University Planning (SCUP)
with the cooperation of
Academic Development and Planning in Transition (ADAPT).

Nordic Hills, Itasca, Illinois
April 17-19, 1974

*

Edited and with an
introduction by

James N. Nesmith
Assistant Provost for Educational Development
University of Dayton, Ohio

Editorial work for these proceedings was supported by a grant to the Society from International Business Machines Corporation.

Published and distributed jointly by the Society for College and University Planning and Educational Testing Service, College and University Programs.

Copies of these proceedings are available for \$3.00 per copy from the Society for College and University Planning, 3 Washington Square Village, New York, New York 10012

Copyright © 1975 by Society for College and University Planning, 3 Washington Square Village, New York, New York 10012. All rights reserved.

Planning Committee

David G. Brown, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio

Thomas Maher, Director, Research and Planning
Ottawa University, Kansas

Norbert Nathanson, Director of Instructional Development
State University of New York, Albany

James N. Nesmith, Chairman
Assistant Provost for Educational Development
University of Dayton, Ohio

H. Gilbert Nicol, Executive Director
Society for College and University Planning

Marvin Peterson, Director
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan

James G. Rice, Vice President for Academic Development
Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

John M. Smart, Deputy Dean for New Programs
California State University and Colleges

Contributors

- A.D. Albright, Executive Director (Chapter II)
Public Council on Higher Education
State of Kentucky
- Stephen K. Bailey, Vice President (Chapter I)
American Council on Education
- David G. Brown, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (Chapter III)
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
- John E. Cantlon, Provost (Chapter II)
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
- Earl B. Cheit, Associate Director (Chapter III)
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education
- David Epperson (Chapter V)
College of Community Studies, Northwestern University
- P. Lawrence Hester, Associate Director of Fiscal Planning (Chapter III)
Vanderbilt University
- David E. Leveille, Associate State University Dean (Chapter V)
New Program Development and Evaluation
Office of the Chancellor
California State University and Colleges
- Thomas H. Maher, Director (Chapter II)
Research and Planning, Ottawa University, Kansas
- William R. O'Connell, Jr., Director (Chapter V)
Undergraduate Education Reform Project
Southern Regional Education Board
- Eldon Park, Director (Chapter V)
Institutional Research Program for Higher Education
Educational Testing Service, Princeton
- Gary H. Quehl, then Executive Director (Chapter V)
College Center of the Finger Lakes
now President, Council for Advancement of Small Colleges
- Virginia B. Smith, Director (Chapter IV)
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
- Robert J. Toft, Dean (Chapter V)
College IV, Grand Valley State Colleges, Michigan

Contents

Introduction	1
J.N. Nesmith	
I. The Problem	
People Planning in Postsecondary Education: Human Resource Development in a World of Decremental Budgets 3	
Stephen K. Bailey	
II. Perspectives	
Academic Planning and Faculty Involvement: The Invisible College Perspective. 13	
Thomas H. Maher	
Statewide Perspectives on Planning with Faculty. 21	
A.D. Albright	
The Threat of Efficiency: Perspective of the Large University. 23	
John E. Cantlon	
III. Strategies	
Planning for Quality 31	
Earl B. Cheit	
The Supreme Role of Faculty in Planning: Why and How? 33	
David G. Brown	
Fiscal Structures and Institutional Decision Making. 45	
P. Lawrence Hester	
IV. Federal Government Involvements	
The View from Washington 53	
Virginia B. Smith	
V. An Array of Working Strategies	
College IV: A New Undergraduate Model 59	
Robert J. Toft	
Increasing Institutional Performance through Faculty Development: A Three-year Experiment Sponsored by the College Center of the Finger Lakes 61	
Gary H. Quehl	

Innovation and Improvement in the California State University and Colleges	67
David E. Leveille	
Regional Assistance to Advance Reform in Undergraduate Education	69
William R. O'Connell, Jr.	
Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment	73
David Epperson	
Some Strategies Involving Institutional Self-Study.	75
Eldon Park	

Introduction

by

James N. Nesmith

Assistant Provost for Educational Development
University of Dayton, Ohio

The conference and the papers presented in this volume grew out of the conviction of a random group of persons who discovered, quite by chance, a shared deep concern: that serious consequences are falling to higher education as a result of financial procedures intended to meet the crisis of survival. It is obvious that survival and solvency are not bad. But the struggle for efficiency and financial effectiveness can all too frequently exhaust the combatants and leave them unaware of the loss of the very human values they fight to save.

In March 1973, the Society for College and University Planning invited representatives of a newly-formed network of several hundred persons who had expressed interest in academic planning and program development, ADAPT (Academic Development and Planning in Transition), to discuss the Society's sponsorship of a workshop on academic planning. Thomas Maher, James Rice and I, who together had developed the ADAPT network, readily agreed to serve on a committee to prepare the program for such a meeting, and I was designated chairman.

This program planning committee, drawn from members of both the Society and ADAPT, represented a wide range of geographical areas and institutional affiliations. With funding from the Society, the committee met in St. Louis in May 1973.

Convinced that educators must be alerted to the pressures for and responses to academic change, the planning committee decided to focus on faculty as a major human resource and on planning as the process through which human and other resources are fully utilized. Thus, the theme and topics chosen reflect the efforts of the committee to focus attention on the need to maintain and improve the quality of the academic experience at a time when budgets are declining.

What can still "another" conference do? It can raise awareness, provide for the input and exchange of information, and induce participants to a new resolve to act.

As chairman of the workshop planning committee and editor of this volume, I am convinced that the meeting met these objectives and at the same time uncovered new questions which must be addressed.

But the point of greatest interest during the conference, and that which the reader of these papers should especially note, was the recurring theme that academic administrators and faculty are defaulting in their response to the very pressures and problems they deplore.

Our shared responsibility as academics concerned with human resources and human values is to devise for ourselves means and procedures by which intangible, nonquantifiable factors in the educational

enterprise can be taken into account when effectiveness is measured and money is provided.

Virtually every speaker alluded to this need. Virginia Smith spoke directly to the point.

This task remains to be done. It should have been done yesterday, but was not. Who can do it and when?

Herein lies the chief contribution of "still another conference" on MORE for LESS. The problem has now been very sharply defined. Some pointers along the way have been provided. Current efforts doing something about all or part of the problem have been described.

The challenge is now before us. This conference will prove its real worth when that next foe is confronted and put in place.

Deep appreciation is expressed to all who had a part in planning, implementing and contributing to the remarkable dialogue set in motion by the conference, these papers, and hopefully, the efforts toward solutions which will follow.

Most of all, it would not have been possible for us to share these insights with you were it not for the generosity of the International Business Machines Corporation, which funded the preparation of the proceedings for publication, and of Educational Testing Service and its director of College and University Programs, Richard L. Burns, for their arrangements to have the publication printed.

I: THE PROBLEM

People Planning in Postsecondary Education: Human Resource Development in a World of Decremental Budgets

by

Stephen K. Bailey
Vice President
American Council on Education

A few months ago, my good friend and former colleague, Ewald B. Nyquist, New York's Education Commissioner, circulated a list of "behavioral laws" that he had learned over the years at "his mother's knee and other low joints." My two texts for today are taken from Joe Nyquist's compilation. The first is corollary 2 of Chisholm's Second Law of Human Interaction. It reads that "anytime things appear to be going better, you have overlooked something." My second text is Harvard's Law of Animal Behavior: to wit, "under carefully controlled conditions, organisms behave as they damm well please."

Both of these texts suggest that alertness and humility are golden attributes in those concerned with people planning in postsecondary education. Chisholm's corollary emphasizes the importance of not settling for simplistic answers. The Harvard behavioral law raises the disquieting possibility that people planning may itself be a contradiction in terms. I hope you will keep these behavioral laws in mind as we attempt together to wander in a partially trackless wilderness of conjecture.

An Entire Learning Community

If a person from Mars (just think, even a few months ago I would have said, "If a man from Mars...") should fly a UFO onto a college campus and stop the nearest stalker or dean, or both, to ask what goes on here, the reply would probably be, "This is an institution of higher education." If the Martian then asked, "What do you manufacture here?", it is hoped the appropriate reply would be, "The college manufactures nothing; it grows ideas and people." Or more precisely, "It helps young people grow and new ideas develop." The Martian catches on fast. After learning more details, he finally asks, "Do you help nonyoung people grow: faculty, administrators, librarians, custodial personnel, research assistants, faculty wives, boards of directors, retired staff?" The stalker has streaked on. But the dean tilts his head quizzically and says, "I'm not sure I understand you." The Martian replies, "How can people who have stopped growing themselves possibly help others grow or help new ideas be born?" With that he presses a button, pops into his UFO and streaks off--sorry, zooms off.

It has often seemed to me that those whose melancholy duty it is to worry about dwindling financial resources are led almost inevitably to think of the people who surround them in the academic community in terms

of impersonal units. That is not Martha Smith and Harry Jones, two part-time students from St. Louis; instead, they together are one F.T.E.--one fulltime equivalent. That is not Dr. Brown, Professor of Humanistic Studies; that is one count of the allowable full professors on the Liberal Arts T/O. The sad-faced lady on the bench is not Dean Clark's widow. It is TIAA beneficiary number 472800. Computers, as someone has said, do not raise the bogey of creating machines that think like people, but people who think like machines.

As times get tougher, as the incremental budgeting of the sixties gives way to the decremental budgeting of the seventies, unless we are scrupulously careful, the temptation for state budget officers, state coordinating committees, boards of trustees, presidents, provosts, deans, and business managers to think like machines will markedly increase. In part, this developing impersonality will be a psychic baffle against the pain of giving pain. In part, it will represent the impact of accountability demands from public and even private donors and monitors. To attack donors and monitors for wanting more efficiency and effectiveness in postsecondary education is surely a cheap shot. As I said in an article in Change a year ago, I have little patience with those who dismiss all attempts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education as unwarranted interference with the sacred prerogatives of academe. We need far more effective management and more efficient ~~state planning than~~ we presently have. But we must also be aware of the subtle paradox inherent in the creation of structural and mechanical means to deal with organic and psychic problems.

My real plea today is not that we dismantle planning and cost effectiveness systems. Nor do I have any secret elixir that will soften the necessity of making hard and painful administrative and committee choices, many of which will be devastating to proximate individuals. What I do want to do is to repair to the final question of our Martian friend and ask, "Can the traumas of withering resources, and the seemingly impersonal requirements of imposed quantitative analysis, be mitigated by attention to qualitative changes in the lives of all those associated with institutions of higher education?" If we cannot save everyone, can we help those who remain to start growing again, especially faculty and administrators? For I have a fairly simple theory: it is that what students take away in a positive sense from an institution of higher education is little more than the spillover of excitement and commitment they observe in the adult models around them. If administrators, faculty, and support staffs are made up of contentious cynics and spiritual zombies, students will develop a notion of the life of the mind that is finally expressed in the phrase "Who needs it?" If, on the other hand, they find themselves surrounded by human beings who exude excitement about their own lives, an invaluable role model is created as young people are induced to recognize the possibilities of joy in the options of continuing growth.

A World of Psychic Anxiety

How can the juices of growth be stimulated in the adults who staff our colleges and universities? To pretend that there are simple answers to this question is to live in the world of make-believe. In my observations over a 30 year period, colleges and universities tend to be incubators

of anxiety for most professionals who work in them. So many pictures race through my mind.

- I see myself nearly three decades ago sitting helplessly at the typewriter, knowing that my Ph.D. dissertation is only half finished, feeling panic as nothing comes to my mind as I try to find a beginning for Chapter VI, hating the entire system for forcing me back upon my own immaturity and ignorance.

- I see a 38 year old colleague in the sciences, out-pointed and put down in a department meeting by a junior colleague, sensing that never again would he be respected as a scientist and that the world had passed him by.

- I see a brilliant young humanist whose literary diet led him to view the universe with the jaundiced eye of twentieth-century nihilism, and who ended up in his garage with a monoxide hose in his mouth.

- I see a sensitive political theorist, slightly drunk, accosting me in the lobby during an intermission of the Broadway production of Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf, saying, "I bet nine-tenths of this audience thinks this play is pure fantasy, but you and I know better, don't we?"

- I see a beautiful 50 year old college president friend slumped over on his desk, dead from a heart attack provoked by student and faculty bullying.

- I see a brilliant young academic so appalled by the psychic violence and the sophistry of his colleagues that he took off 20 years ago for a Maine fishing village where he has lived ever since.

- I see endless committee meetings at which trivia are fondled and important issues nibbled to death by anxiety-ridden colleagues.

- I see young faculty so hurt or ignored by senior colleagues as to buy the friendship of young students with cheap grades and an involuted sycophancy.

- I see 45 year olds, tired of teaching the same stuff, lacking the opportunity and the will to become updated, caught in a nontransferable state pension system, sinking slowly into a permanent torpor relieved only by the bottle and somebody else's wife.

- I see eager graduate student minds, stretching to capture the multidisciplinary richness of a problem, told not to fritter away their time and settle for the demands of the departmental system.

These are not the only images I have of the world of higher education. If they were, I should have jumped ship years ago. But there is far too much of this negative reality around, and, unless we are careful, the anxieties produced by the increased firing of even tenured faculty, and the knowledge that there are no jobs elsewhere, will exacerbate the hostilities and the psychic withdrawals that already exist on too many campuses. The hunger for security can make people alternately vicious and withdrawn.

During the sixties, when a seller's market existed for both administrators and faculty, tensions or unhappiness on one campus could be relieved by an easy jump to another position in a different institution. Or, if the life of scholarship and teaching palled, one could aspire to a deanship, or a college presidency, or a resident directorship of an overseas outpost where the world could be saved with a tropical Collins in hand.

Now these opportunities for psychic relief are more and more difficult to find. Instead, faculty will be tenured-in for longer periods of time; fewer young people will join the staffs and provide the ginger of newness; administrators will see their leadership capabilities frittered away in endless negotiations with anxious and often preemptive faculty committees, union bargainers, trustees, task forces, student caucuses, and state budgeteers; timidity will spread a dull, gray Linus blanket of tradition over every aspect of college life; student alienation will become endemic. And a vicious circle will have been created, for public and legislative support will wither, and this will exacerbate the very tendencies that led to public disillusionment in the first place.

This is a possible--some would say, a probable--scenario of the future. But it does not have to be. I would contend that there are ways of turning much of this around and that these ways involve paying special attention to the quality of life of the adult staffs associated with colleges and universities. If I am right, and if this can be done, then it must follow as the night the day that student motivation, attitudes, and behavior will change, and so ultimately will public demand and public support.

Support for Administrators

There are many points of entry into this problem. I think that a major point is at the level of boards of trustees. They are sufficiently marginal to the day-to-day workings of the present system, yet sufficiently tied to it and concerned about it to make an enormous difference if they have the will. They can do far more than most of them have done in the past to help public and private donors maintain and even increase financial resources for higher education. This in itself could help reduce a portion of the destructive anxieties that seem to be increasingly manifest on campuses. But beyond this important function, trustees can pay special attention to the care and feeding of the chancellor, or president, who reports to them. They can exercise restraint in complicating his life still further by interfering in day-to-day administrative decisions. They can give him support in making hard choices. They can help as a sounding board for organizational changes that may help or hurt his capacity for academic leadership. They can insure him adequate personal assistance, especially in those aspects of his work where he may be weak by aptitude or training. They can insist on frequent short leaves and occasional long leaves so that he can replenish his energy, get new perspectives, and generally, as my father used to put it, "keep his soul on top." When necessary, they can tell him with firmness as well as kindness that the institution needs new leadership, that he needs to turn to a new kind of task, and that they will make provision before or after his resignation for some useful and necessary decompression chamber of study or travel.

I mention this relationship between board and president first because the success of that relationship can set the tone for an entire institution. Trustees who become part of the problem rather than part of the solution can produce more mischief than they are ever aware of. Those of us who are trustees need more educating about our key responsibilities than most of us ever get. I commend to governing boards, colleges and university planners, and all concerned with these matters that learning experiences for trustees be fostered so that they may play an increasingly significant and appropriate role in developing the skills and morale of the administrators under them.

What is true of trustees is equally true of top executives and administrators. The great college administrator, in my estimation, is one who understands the relationship between helping adult colleagues grow and helping students grow. Just as the trustees need to worry about the President's mental and physical health, so he must be concerned with the health of those who share with him the major administrative tasks of managing the university: vice presidents, provosts, business managers, personnel directors, and so on. Administrative sabbaticals; frequent short vacations for those who are impossibly pressed by tension and overwork; early attention to signs of irascibility and neurosis; a word of support and gratitude for a brave and wise decision; even more important, a word of general support along with counsel when a specific matter has been handled badly; involvement of wives in circumstances and ceremonials that give administrators a brief sense of status and worth; a demonstration of collegiality in the formulation of policies that involve the cooperation of administrators in their implementation; keeping ever alive the possibilities of promotion from within. These are some obvious ways of nurturing the growth of administrators.

Most of these suggestions are, I believe, applicable at the level of deans, associate deans, divisional directors, and department or program chairmen. Anything that gives people a sense of being valued, temporary relief from inordinate pressure and tension, occasional opportunities for self-realization, and a feeling of creative partnership in collective activities and problem solving clears away a lot of weeds and opens up new opportunities for growth.

Faculty Development

A special word needs to be said about faculty. The ideal faculty model, I suppose, is someone introspective and disciplined enough to find great psychic satisfaction in the lonely pursuit of new knowledge, someone secure enough to work effectively with others in team research and academic committees, someone gregarious enough to love students, someone articulate enough to do inspired teaching, and someone concerned enough to indulge in a variety of public services. I have known very few of these renaissance types in my life. Most of us play one or two of these roles passably. Part of faculty anxiety is that the expectation is so far beyond the reach of most of us. One of the psychic compensations for these performance shortfalls used to be the deference that teachers received from students. Even though this was in part a deference of manners and prudence, it eased some of the hurt left over in faculty psyches from perceived multiple-role inadequacies. Much of this has changed. Students are bolder, franker in their criticisms,

less frightened by faculty sanctions. Today, they are as often an additional source of threat to faculty egos as they are sustainers of those egos. My hunch is that part of the changed student attitude is induced by subconscious comparisons of, say, an oceanography professor's lecture on the one hand, and last night's TV episode in the explorations of Jacques Cousteau on the other. It is tough on a \$25,000 biology professor to compete in terms of dramatic techniques with a \$1 million documentary. The implied criticism of faculty in this respect is woefully unfair, but, in a subconscious sense, it may be prevalent.

How does one grow faculty or help them grow? Some will ask whether or not faculty are not already the most pampered of professionals: long vacations, the security of tenure, portable pensions, fairly decent salaries, work time to do research on things of interest to them, sabbaticals, laboratory and library facilities for experimentation and reference, conferences and meetings in distant cities for collegial refreshment. What a life!

The difficulty is that for most faculty in this nation's colleges and universities, these vaunted privileges and opportunities are a myth. And where they have existed, they are increasingly being eroded by tight budgets and extraneous demands on faculty time. While roughly two-thirds of the faculty and administrators in the United States have the portable benefits of TIAA/CREF, the remaining third are locked into state or local pension systems that give few or no benefits to those who opt out, or are forced out, of the system during the first couple of decades of their employment. Someday, hopefully, the entire nation will carry a uniform pension system, which, like TIAA/CREF, can be transported to any other institution or area without loss to the individual. Anything any of us can do to increase the portability of non-TIAA pension systems will increase staff freedom and morale in colleges and universities.

Tenure is no longer sacrosanct. Even if it were, some cruel dilemmas are ahead. A system of total tenure would mean an increasingly rigid and conservative faculty with new entries permitted only when oldsters die off. On the other hand, a small percentage of tenured faculty at the top only could mean an increase in the viciousness of competition on the long way up and the releasing of nontenured faculty at a time in their thirties or early forties when family obligations are most pressing and when good jobs may be scarce, particularly in esoteric fields. But even here there is no guarantee that reductions in force will not hit tenured and nontenured alike or that hard-pressed administrators will not use whatever tenure ratios exist to keep down the number of high-salaried old timers.

Reductions in force, incidentally, can play havoc with affirmative action efforts of recent years. If seniority governs the reduction-in-force plan, women and minorities may well be the first to be fired. Some imaginative redefinition of seniority must be fashioned if this ominous state of affairs is not to come into being. In the years ahead, this surely will be one of the most important items on the agenda of collective bargaining on university campuses.

Experiments in Faculty Enrichment

With these and similar difficulties and dilemmas, much can still be done to increase faculty spirit and enhance faculty development during hard times. Experiments are presently going on all over the nation that point to some of the ways in which this can be done.

- Faculty can be given temporary load reductions to work on a new course or on an important piece of research. (I shall never forget the generosity of the late Elmer Schattschneider who was Chairman of the Government Department of Wesleyan. He gave me a reduced teaching load for three semesters so that I might finish my Ph.D.)

- Audiovisual and programmed-learning techniques can be used to stimulate individual student learning while reducing the burden of daily preparation on the teacher.

- Postdoctoral "modular" fellowships can be awarded by foundations and government agencies to improve the opportunity for faculty members to move, during a short or long vacation, to another country or to another area of this country to refresh or update their knowledge about a particular course of part of an academic field. This suggests a particular mission for some of our major advanced research institutions. They can organize a variety of short courses to help meet the increased demand for intellectual refreshment from faculty of other institutions.

- Minicourses of one or two credit hours can be encouraged, enabling a faculty member to try out new ideas in an experimental setting.

- Portfolios of reading notes, new syllabi, public service activities, and restructured bibliographies can be allowed to serve as alternatives to publications as criteria for promotion.

- The concept of the sabbatical can be reinstated and reinforced, recognizing that the knowledge explosion will drown all of us if our learned professionals are not given time to break away from what they are doing on a day-to-day basis.

- Travel and conference funds can be protected at all costs, even when the trade-off may be the pain of another firing.

- Teachers who have become bored with their subject matter field can be encouraged to work with others in multidisciplinary, problem-solving groups, and a few should be permitted to take a leave (with outside financial help) to pursue advanced study through the doctorate in a totally different field than their original Ph.D.

- Faculty can be encouraged to work with adult learners in nontraditional settings as a way of finding new meaning and new stimuli in academic pedagogy. (I do not believe that we have even begun to scratch the surface of the enormous market represented by potential adult learners in this

country. If we went after this market systematically, many of our financial problems would be over.)

- Faculty can develop far greater insight into their inevitable and crucial roles as student counselors and can be helped to increase their contact hours with individual students. Again, educational technology that assists in the presentation of knowledge can ease the faculty member's preparation schedule and can open up additional time for student counseling.

I have only scratched the surface. All of you can think of dozens of ways in which the lives of faculty members can be made richer and more rewarding. Many of these changes can take place in an atmosphere of decremental budgeting if we ask ourselves basic questions about effective resource allocation if we really exploit the possibilities of educational technology, and if we recognize that even when general budgets are squeezed, government agencies and philanthropy are still looking for investment opportunities in human capital.

Reawakening, Excitement and Loyalty

All of what I have said to this point is ultimately directed, of course, at the welfare and growth of students. I do not know enough to tell you how to turn on the light of enthusiasm in students by direct action. Students are central but they are also transient. My guess is that we do them our greatest honor and benefit by consciously improving the quality of the institutions they attend--the quality of life of chancellors and presidents, of provosts and deans, of department heads and faculty and the quality of academic standards and professional requirements. If we can do this, and if society can help to equalize educational opportunity for all its citizens through appropriate financial-support measures, the great enterprises we represent will continue to flourish even during periods of financial retrenchment.

At its best, a college or university is a wonderful phenomenon: a place of excitement and ferment, a place where history meets the future, a forum for the reexamination of orthodoxies, a luxuriant garden of wisdom and skill, a refiner of style, a cafeteria of options. Somewhere in the fifties or sixties, faculty and students seemed to lose all sense of loyalty to the institutions of which they were a part. Loyalty was to a professional discipline or to a geographic region or to a way of life, but rarely to an institution. Now that fortunes are somewhat reversed, perhaps if we work at it, we can re-create the sense of institutional loyalty that I recognized and valued when I was in college. At its worst, such loyalty was maudlin and nostalgic. But at its best, it provided everyone connected with it a deep sense of psychic security and mutual trust.

In a world in which the only responsible education is education for contingency, when all the familiar moral landmarks seem to have

crumbled, when true feeling is threatened by the transiency of brittle sensations, when, in the haunting words of Sir Francis Bacon, "my soul hath been a stranger in the course of my pilgrimage," a renewed concern with improving the human resources within our several institutions of higher education can have enormous significance. Institutions of higher learning peopled by vibrant human beings could, if we give them a little time, turn the decay we see all around us into the nourishing mulch of some future awakening.

Nearly 20 years ago, Albert Camus summed it all up. "We have," he said, "nothing to lose except everything. So let us push forward! This is the challenge of our generation. If we are doomed to failure, it will at least have been better to side with those who want to live, rather than with the destroyers."

II. PERSPECTIVES

Academic Planning and Faculty Involvement: The Invisible College Perspective

by

Thomas H. Maher, Director
Research and Planning
Ottawa University (Kansas)

The next decade is certain to be a most critical period in the existence of hundreds of small, private liberal arts colleges across the nation. Having lived precariously close to the margin for much of their corporate lives, many of these institutions appear now to be facing perhaps their most challenging crisis.

The institutions of which I speak have achieved some instant and collective notoriety from a report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education that has labelled them "invisible" colleges.* Any observer of American higher education must be impressed with the resourcefulness of such colleges in meeting threats to their existence and quality. On the other hand, I would contend that many of these decisions provide the stuff of short-term institutional survival but neglect to ask questions that deal with mission, quality, adequacy of resource base, or organizational implications over time. The social environment, however, is changing, and it is becoming increasingly evident that continued existence will demand systematic planning and development (p/d). A function is required that transcends traditional images of institutional research and encompasses and integrates program assessment, long-range planning, environmental analysis, consensus building, generation of alternatives and development of new approaches to fulfillment of institutional missions.

At first glance it would seem that any p/d function in the invisible college will be up against a decade of insoluble problems. The institutional momentum needed to sustain quality makes increasing demands on thinly stretched resources. Glimpses of a dramatic decline in the pool of 18-22 year old students in the eighties would seem to suggest a heightening of the frenetic yearly scramble for freshmen. Current inflationary trends harbinger impossible-to-meet yearly budgets.

For those who do have the inclination to deal realistically with these projections, however, there is a possibility of creative academic planning that can provide an institution with both the psychic and fiscal capacity to resist current trends and turn adversity to growth.

*Alexander Astin and Calvin Lee, The Invisible Colleges: A Profile of Small, Private Colleges with Limited Resources, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Problems of maintaining faculty and staff morale in a period of uncertainty about the future, declining or unstable enrollment, frozen salaries, low mobility, and cuts of both tenured and nontenured faculty make up a task suited for some kind of academic Hercules. Yet, a psychologically healthy community of learners is a primary requisite for the success of the educational experience the invisible colleges claim to offer.

As the p/d function attempts to provide both for survival and for morale, it must self-consciously remain in touch, at all points, with the purpose of the institution it serves as well as with the function of liberal education. This is not to advise that a college chain itself to a particular view of liberal education. Rather, an institution should engage in an ongoing process of focusing and refocusing upon objectives, making them more precise and self-conscious, reinterpreting them in the light of cultural and institutional experiences, and incorporating them into its planning process.

Role of Faculty

The faculty of an invisible college holds the key to success or failure of planning and development. The problem of planning for, maintaining, and building faculty morale is especially important in the invisible college because of the community nature of the enterprise. At the same time, it would seem extremely important to involve an informed faculty in the p/d process, not only to supplement thinly stretched resources, but also to gain emotional investment and commitment to various courses of action. The following discussion of imperatives, constraints, and resources should be read from the perspective of an underlying theme that argues for creative faculty participation in the p/d process.

Planning/Development Imperatives

It may prove helpful to discuss some of the needs of a viable p/d function in the small college, enumerate a number of constraints, and then elaborate upon steps that can be taken to bypass the barriers to survival and quality. I suggest nine tasks necessary to adequate p/d in the invisible college:

1. Invisible colleges must attempt to stay continually in touch with their purposes, but this involves lengthy philosophical discussion in a decision-making environment that values simple, pragmatic, short-term response.
2. Invisible colleges must develop an adequate informational base for an evaluational and cost-effective approach to management, but, in many instances, invisible colleges do not have the computational equipment or the manpower to build or maintain adequate internal information systems, to say nothing of monitoring the external environment. Beyond the basic sets of information needed for institutional decision, there is

a host of test, interview, and observational data that can be invaluable in the process of educational evaluation.

3. Invisible colleges must develop and maintain as accurate a view of the future as possible, but, given current staffing levels, it appears almost impossible to monitor local, regional, and national trends and maintain this frame of reference for decision making.
4. Invisible colleges must make decisions in such a way as to keep options open for as long a period as possible, but the speed of response of a small college and the lack of manpower to generate alternative futures creates the danger of decisions closing options before we really understand what is happening.
5. Invisible colleges must invest in a program of long-term faculty and staff development, but currently lack the resources to do so.
6. Invisible colleges must continually explore linkages to a variety of other institutions, but frozen images of the college and of liberal education often prevent imaginative venture into greener pastures.
7. Invisible colleges must provide ongoing evaluation research into their educational process and product and must invent means of responding to this information in an optimum fashion, but the traditional organizational style of the invisible college does not provide it with a felt need for evaluative research.
8. Invisible colleges must find means of alerting their entire academic communities to the issues at stake, the nature of the decisions that must be made, and the long-term consequences of choosing certain alternatives, but the way in which faculty are currently utilized in the p/d process militates against this possibility.
9. Invisible colleges must create a modifiable long-range corporate strategy that subsumes an adequate view of the future and each of the other planning imperatives listed. Only through this use of shared frames of reference as context will any of these institutions emerge enhanced as educational leaders, but corporate visions are difficult to establish and require even more effort to maintain, especially in a day-to-day survival crunch.

Elaboration of Constraints

The key constraint on much of the p/d operation in the invisible college appears to be the lack of resources--time, money, and personnel--to insure adequate coverage of tasks. The range of responsibilities or imperatives for the p/d function in the small college covers the

same territory as those in the multiversity. Yet, many invisible colleges have no p/d function whatsoever and others have seen fit to support only a rudimentary, record-keeping, institutional-research office.

The planning imperatives I have elaborated are not unlike the set of process objectives one would direct toward any organization, except that they perhaps stress awareness and analysis of purpose to a far greater degree than would be the case for most corporate bodies. In the invisible college, however, the tendency to evolve a common purpose is often frustrated by a splitting of academic hairs, a tendency for the faculty to divide along selection of means rather than ends of liberal education. There is no question that this endemic, occupational malady enervates general institutional planning.

Another constraint on long-range planning that involves problems of scale in the small college is that one must often substitute personalities for organizational units in the discussion of alternatives. It becomes more difficult to speak of phasing out or reducing the anthropology department by two-thirds when that department consists of one tenured individual who has managed to weave his career into the fabric of the community. This small scale phenomenon has rarely been spoken of in the literature of academic planning, but it destroys our rational-man view of the planning process.

The dynamics of leadership in the small college are another factor complicating the prospects for the implantation of an effective p/d process. The executive in the small college is not checked to the same extent by the distribution of bureaucratic power as is his colleague in the multiversity. Neither is he accustomed to arriving at decisions in the midst of the information rich environment of the state institution. In invisible colleges, leaders are apt to respond quickly and to the point, dealing with a far wider array of problems in a more rapid fashion than do administrators in a more complex university.

This is not to suggest a reckless approach to decision making, but one does not get the picture of an environment nurturing an effective planning function. In fact, the relationship among the line officers in an invisible college has likely evolved to the point that decisions (on administrative, not academic questions) are corroborated by shared, operational frames of reference developed through pragmatic give and take. Long-standing disagreement in the high councils may air all the alternatives but implies a cost in time and energy that runs counter to the style of operating the typical invisible college. All of this suggests a host of new problems that center around the role of any p/d officer and his relationship to the line operation.

The lack of human resources prevents adequate attention to the p/d function and rivets thinly stretched administrative attention to short-run maintenance questions. Further, academic organization as it now exists in most institutions is defeating of an institution-wide perspective on the part of most faculty. Since data about the health of the school are usually not well disseminated or well understood,

potentially valuable faculty planners often withdraw and become frightened cynics.

Quick response, which can be seen as the major resource of an invisible college, can also become a constraint. Whether the current fad is nontraditional education, competency-based learning or environmentally related core curricula, scores of invisible colleges must of necessity be ready to leap onto the bandwagon. Undoubtedly, some of these institutions have guessed right and will grow healthy for a period of time, but at the same instant have foreclosed a variety of unseen options.

The community nature of the invisible college can be a set of social circumstances that can make academic life either a psychological desert or an inspiring, growth-enhancing situation. In my experience, faculty in a small college sometimes find it psychologically possible to be involved in making painful, short-term, on-the-spot decisions about release of certain colleagues. The same groups, however, often find it extremely difficult to deal with long-term phasing out of individuals related to program development and reduction. Unless an institution decides to deal honestly with the question of tenure and "dead wood," the fact of entrenched incompetence becomes literally impossible to deal with, foreclosing all manner of planning possibilities to a much greater extent than would be the case in the multiversity where resources are available for a number of bypass operations.

Resources

How can faculty be effectively used in the p/d process? Differentiated staffing is one means of utilizing faculty. There is no reason why invisible colleges cannot seek faculty members who, in addition to academic competence, have interest in planning, self-study, and reform activities. Few colleges approach the employment process with the express intention of salting their faculty or staff with this dimension of educational expertise.

The invisible college must constantly be reminded that the oversupply of teachers constitutes one of its greatest resources in the winter of discontent.

Nevertheless, the very richness of the resource has generated some carelessness on the part of employers who are inundated with applications. Even in a time of oversupply, it remains difficult to find the "right" or "best" person. Good student advisors, interdisciplinary teachers, and those with sound perspectives on planning are difficult to locate even in the best of times. P/d input is essential in developing a design for the faculty and a time-based strategy for moving toward it.

Another set of resources that can enable the integration of faculty with the p/d process are the roles played by a variety of external agencies. For example, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education is a funding agency providing leadership for the kinds of adaptive steps that must be taken by invisible colleges. Questions

asked by the fund (for example, its insistence on thorough evaluation of funded projects) can provide real support for the p/d functions within colleges. Regional accrediting agencies could play a larger role in enhancing p/d activities in the colleges by focusing upon the health of the p/d operation and/or by including planning expertise on their visiting teams.

Most attempts to provide for the kind of function we have called p/d have resulted in the appointment of an educational development officer, usually in a staff position. My judgment is that these positions are largely useful in providing some well-defined technical expertise (such as financial analysis), but that they rarely effect true educational reform. To be successful, the role must combine concrete skills and capacities essential to the function of the line officers, or essential tasks must be clearly defined and located in the p/d office.

Most invisible colleges that have employed an educational development officer have yet to unravel the tangle of role-related difficulties that render such positions less rather than more effective. Unfortunately, the appointment of an individual in this position sometimes psychologically removes the responsibility for planning, development, and evaluation from the general faculty and isolates it. Unless this officer has access to the faculty through the academic dean and is involved in teaching, advising, and committee work, he stands little chance of making major impact. Suffice to say that any p/d position is likely to occupy a role marginal to many functions in the college and this will have to be borne in mind when attempting organizational integration.

Alternatively, there are a number of other routes a financially strapped invisible college may travel short of a specially appointed educational development officer:

- The social research course, which becomes focused on program evaluation.
- The statistics course, which deals with institutional data.
- The psychology course, which deals with student characteristics.
- The futuristics course, which develops alternative institutional futures.
- The business sequence, which develops and maintains information systems.
- Released time, which is given to certain faculty on a revolving basis to participate on a committee for p/d.
- Student interns from economics, psychology, business, and other fields participating in the p/d process for tuition reduction.
- A consortium of colleges that supplies p/d research from a central base to member colleges.

- Faculty development contracts aimed at creating planning and educational development expertise among members of the faculty.

The idea of faculty development contracts is a potentially important p/d function. Not only could an emphasis on faculty development provide a new set of planning skills, but it could also enable an institution to restructure itself through the development of new faculty competencies. A carefully negotiated process, set in the context of institutional goals, could become one of the most important and effective p/d processes in the institution. Linked to the idea of faculty development contracts is another p/d function: a faculty evaluation process that enables a bargaining process through which the individual and the institution create a mutually agreeable pathway to development.

I noted earlier the fragmentation of faculty perspective and how the splitting of academic hairs often mires educational decision making. To plan and to respond with integrity to new challenges, an institution must create new ways of achieving agreement on at least the arena of discourse. There are a number of new approaches that have been derived for consensus building, and, in my experience, the Delphi technique is one of the most effective. With this technique, it is possible to gain a general consensus that can serve as a framework for discussion and decision making. Perhaps its most important function is that of enabling a group to focus more clearly upon the objectives at hand and eliminate the meaningless circumlocution that clouds so many educational planning ventures.

Another p/d tool that impinges on faculty is the growing possibility and potentiality of faculty exchange. In a small college context, this is a process that must be planned carefully. Done well, it can be a source of planning expertise, albeit temporary, and new images of possibility among one's own faculty. This is especially true if faculty exchange can be carried on with unique institutions and in unique teaching circumstances. Even more useful, perhaps, would be periodic faculty placement in nonuniversity job situations for this would leaven the community with a new set of perspectives that could give rise to new possibilities.

I have mentioned earlier the reluctance of faculty in a small college community to think in terms of long-range reallocation of resources. A high priority for a p/d function is to provide forums and settings in which faculty are emboldened to sketch out quantitative and qualitative consequences of planning decisions without being under the gun for a decision. (We generally seem to involve faculty when we are most pressed for a decision!)

In a number of settings, then, faculty should be encouraged to dwell upon a wide range of possibilities. This might take the form of simulating a variety of approaches to reducing the faculty and staff, the discussion of a range of potential mergers, and the creation of new institutions from elements of the college. I would even propose a blue-sky or big-issue committee that would be responsible for interpreting cultural trends and linking these to the planning and decision-making process. Academics who are many times accused of blue-skying

to the extreme are often pedantic and unimaginative when viewing the future of their own enterprise. We need continuous consideration of new alternatives and evaluation of new and creative linkages to other social institutions.

Finally, a successful p/d function must be set in an organizational context that lends itself to the development of new images of academic life. There should be a set of organizational structures that supplement departmental hegemony over institutional evolution. The place of programs, centers, institutes, and similar structures is to create role ambiguity for faculty and to release more agendas and possibilities into the body politic. It is in an organizational environment of this nature that the p/d function can best facilitate and catalyze an organization to develop more of its potentiality.

Conclusion

I have spoken of the necessity of involving faculty in the academic planning and development process in the invisible college. This strategy will produce a greater level of costs in terms of time, coordination of people, and the energy required for communication. On the other hand, involvement of the faculty in the p/d process not only provides a greater resource base and support for the process itself, but also improves understanding and consequent investment by the faculty in the purposes and processes of the college. In the last analysis, it may be that this psychological investment is the key to both faculty morale and healthy planning. Perhaps this careful but systematic involvement of the faculty in planning and development is the means not only to survival but to enhancing quality in the invisible college.

Statewide Perspectives on
Planning with Faculty

by
Dr. A.D. Albright
Executive Director, Kentucky
Public Council on Higher Education

(Highlights prepared by J.N.N.)

As head of one statewide board of higher education structured to monitor and coordinate rather than to control, Dr. Albright had several distinct emphases to make to the conference. Unfortunately, his tight schedule precluded his preparation of a full manuscript, but the following are highlights:

1. Apprehension is the characteristic response of faculty to statewide planning. Much of this seems due to the now familiar pressures of declining enrollments and dwindling resources with consequent fear of termination. Private institutions share less in this generalized apprehension because most states now include them in planning. Moreover, some 36 states now have some form of student assistance that is portable to private institutions. Yet apprehension exists and must be taken into account.
2. More, rather than less, statewide planning lies ahead. This is necessitated by the increased need for analysis and assessment of the implications for education of broad social change. It is also mandated by the public through its legislative bodies in the interest of coordination, economy, and avoiding duplication.
3. Planning must include faculty since professional expertise is badly needed. The problem of how to include faculty, however, is yet to be solved. Not only do mechanisms not now exist, but faculty often have the attitude that their professional expertise in one narrow specialty does not equip them for comprehensive planning. Unlike the British, we do not have a University Grants Committee, made up of faculty, that makes recommendations to a Ministry of Education. Another problem is how to coordinate faculty input with that from other experts whose interests and loyalties go beyond particular disciplines and particular institutions.
4. Statewide agencies should encourage and assist but not make decisions for separate institutions. Incentives should be provided and worthy efforts tangibly rewarded. But even when the greatest care and best intentions by the state are met with defensiveness, the state must proceed with policy intervention. For example, the leave and sabbatical policies of few institutions provide for the retraining and reparation that has now become professionally necessary for faculty members.

State boards must see to it that policies are adjusted to new realities. Similarly, the admissions programs and procedures of state-sponsored institutions must be redefined to eliminate unwarranted competition for state funds based on head counts of students. Also, health service planning must be coordinated with existing facilities and population needs within a given state.

5. Unless state boards and the institutions within their jurisdiction are attentive to such problems as noted, not to mention numerous others, state legislatures will increasingly interfere. There is no other road to the accountability the public is now demanding.

The Threat of Efficiency: Perspective of
the Large University

by

John E. Cantlon, Provost
Michigan State University

While much has already been said on the subject, I must also observe that efficiency need not be, and must not become, a threat to higher education. In an inflating economy with urgent, competing demands for national, state, local, and private resources, higher education simply must be recognized as no longer (if indeed it ever did) occupying top priority in local, state, national, or international milieus. Postsecondary education must and will become more efficient; in the process, it can become more effective if we settle down to work creatively toward legitimate educational objectives and stop the hand wringing.

Threats to Real Efficiency

I would like to agree, however, that many well-intentioned but mindless actions, taken by or imposed upon an institution or a system of higher education in the name of efficiency, can constitute a threat--not only to quality, but to the long-range well-being of higher education itself. I will illustrate this with three broad categories.

1. First, the use of overly simplistic measures of efficiency.

- A. For example, the spurious equation: "Increasing SCH/FTE = increasing efficiency." We must remember that universities are complex structures and that their desired outputs are: 1) competently trained and enlightened graduates of several levels; 2) substantial research and scholarly works; 3) operationally effective extension activities or transfers of information to where they can be put to work. If educational bureaucracies or legislatures continue to confuse input, output, and process variables, we are in trouble. For example, we could become locked into some artificially selected SCH/FTE ratio, a process variable frequently confused as a measure of institutional output. We could thereby well miss the true output measures and create a climate in which faculty would resist all attempts to reduce student classroom hours by substituting other equally, or possibly more effective, learning techniques.
- B. Another example of an overly simplistic efficiency index is when legislative committees or educational bureaucracies have selected some arbitrary number of faculty contact hours, again a process variable, and imposed this as a minimum faculty load. In one year, institutions in one state had their budgets reduced proportionately to the number of faculty in the prior fall term who were below an arbitrarily selected contact-hour level. Obviously, such

actions, if continued, would encourage universities to break all large classes into small ones. It would discourage productive, large lecture or TV-moderated instruction as well as discourage an institution from permitting individual faculty members to operate on reduced contact hours while they reorganize their instructional programs, even when such reorganization might lead to more efficient and effective instruction.

- C. This list can be extended ad nauseam where bureaucratic, small-minded thinking has been brought to bear on highly complex universities. One such approach assumes that courses whose approved credit hours are larger than their actual contact hours somehow cheat the state and the student. Such thinking, if permitted to determine funding policies, could seriously impede any real improvement in the instructional process--a process that remains at the "cottage industry" level of development and continually calls for real innovation. It could also impose a substantial economic disincentive to credit-by-examination, independent study, and the like.
2. Second, short-run responses to each fluctuation in program enrollment without examining institutional objectives, state needs, and long-term probabilities. The recent downturn in K-12 enrollments coupled with large college of education enrollments (which were stimulated by teacher shortages) created a temporary overproduction of K-12 teachers. In the name of efficiency, there have been many demands that immediate enrollment adjustments be made. Many of us could foresee this overproduction and had instituted selective enrollment curbs well before entering students perceived the job market message. When the students came to understand the job market, enrollment controls were no longer needed. However, care must be taken that we not overreact and trim our capacities. There is a critical mass that must be preserved to keep quality programs viable, and faculty resources and support must be flexibly responsive up and down around this solid core. Not all this flexible response needs to be vested in tenured faculty.
3. A third type of mistaken idea concerning efficiency is insistence on institutional or system-wide uniformity. This is probably as serious as the error of seizing upon simplistic efficiency indices and then making the double error of choosing a process rather than an output measure as the appropriate productivity index. Large single institutions (and I presume even more so in multicampused state systems) are best operated when the subunits are able to capitalize upon their unique strengths and special opportunities while avoiding their special weaknesses and resistances.

Higher education represents a teaching-learning process that demands recognition of individual differences among students, faculty members, and disciplines as well as among locations,

programs, traditions, and so on. Hence, uniformity and effectiveness tend to be incompatible. Mindless insistence is especially tempting when from one viewpoint it permits optimization of one process in the institution by making it uniform throughout. Such temptations exist in personnel decisions, faculty work patterns, curriculum decision making, use of support staff, budgeting procedures, and the like.

I cannot help but comment on my personal bias here relative to what I see emerging in faculty collective bargaining in other institutions. In my judgment, this new force appears to be accelerating movement toward uniformity, both by actions of management and the faculty representatives. It is urgent that we recognize that scholarly and learning environments are not uniform among the myriad of units that make up universities and set about identifying which of these differences are very important to maintain.

Problems of Pursuing Efficiency

This list of three threats of efficiency pursued with inadequate understanding of the highly personalized nature of the learning and research processes of a large university can be expanded greatly. I will resist the temptation, however, and focus now more specifically on the problems of pursuing efficiency in a large university.

1. The very large university budget. The very size of a large university's budget can make it a special target in legislative or executive budget cutting. Since so much of a university's budget is in faculty salaries--which we all recognize must be moved along in a sustained inflationary period--the areas that are especially vulnerable to underfunding in the large university are supplies and services, equipment, library and support facilities, and staff. When the enrollment boom was on, many older, large institutions managed to receive appropriations for faculty positions, but additional funds for supplies and services, equipment, and libraries lagged. This was partly compensated for by federal programs that held back disaster. Now that institutions have stopped growing and federal programs have been curtailed, inflation prevents even a standstill, let alone a catch up in these areas. As obsolescence overtakes instructional and research equipment, this area, as compared with a pre-boom norm, could easily become a national disgrace.
2. Earlier, I mentioned the seriousness of trying to achieve efficiency through increasing uniformity. In a large, complex institution, uniformity is a virtual impossibility. The medical school and the math department have very little in common in faculty working hours, salaries, outside pressures on faculty or departments, faculty evaluations, legal liability, state legislative interest, or federal support. Similar differences can be identified between the college of engineering and the school of social work, or the college of business and the art

department. What might be a welcome and effective target for improving efficiency in one area is often unworkable, even if acceptable, in another unit.

3. An element in nonuniformity that is a problem is the range in program and faculty quality. Most university administrators would rather "streak" a public symposium than admit that disparate faculty quality is a major problem in improving both efficiency and effectiveness. The truth of the matter is, however, that in a large university whole units can be characterized as predominantly outstanding or poor. As is often the case, the quality of units becomes positively correlated with efficiency and effectiveness if these objectives are clearly identified as not being at the expense of quality.

Those administrators among us who have spent a couple of decades in the classroom before going into administration are aware of the large number of inefficient processes and conditions connected with higher education: for example, redundancy in curricula, nonessential prerequisites, excessive time spent by graduate students in getting advanced degrees, inadequate coordination among courses, poor classroom scheduling, too little attention given to preparing graduate teaching assistants and new faculty members for effective instruction, too little training for chairmen and administrative assistants, and so on.

Good units working through faculty participation and imaginative, management-minded chairmen tend to get at these obvious improvements with no perception of the process being threatening, provided at least part of the savings made reverts to the units for meeting new challenges. Poor and often insecure faculties are less eager and far more wary of change. Each proposal is examined for its potential impact on reducing faculty or support staff or changing working schedules. Also, time spent in departmental academic-governance processes, grievance procedures, and so on, in my experience, seems to be negatively correlated with faculty quality. Self-assured, productive and motivated faculty tend to organize each meeting to maximize its effectiveness and efficiency so they can go on to the main business of their discipline or school. The large university tends to have a wide range in faculty quality with its attendant problems.

4. A similar phenomenon is the fact that the range in student quality in large institutions is also large. The hiatus between special disadvantaged students, some of the intercollegiate athletes, and two-year agricultural technology students, at one extreme, and National Merit Finalists and graduate students, at the other extreme, conveys the range. Furthermore, in large institutions student talent is neither randomly nor evenly distributed. I will not start any quarrels here by naming the disciplines that attract the poorer students. However, it is clear that any uniform approach to efficiency and effectiveness would have to accommodate the differing capacities of these students as well as the differing capabilities and motivations of the various faculties across the university.

Effective Actions

What types of action can a large university take to improve its efficiency and effectiveness? I will list some we have tried.

1. Departmental Reviews--one of the most effective.

- A. Internal resource studies with central administration, college deans, departmental chairmen and faculty representatives studying together the institution's goals, college goals, unit goals, resources available, possible outputs, and rank ordering of outputs and then negotiating those changes that can be agreed to. We have worked with departments, schools, and even colleges as a unit. Both during growth periods and in the present retrenchment conditions, I recommend this approach as the most rewarding per unit of effort, but the demand on administrative time is great and the quality of administrative staff required is high. The bulk of the data for such a study must be generated by central administration and reacted to by the unit.
- B. External reviews are more effective for evaluating special items. They work best with academically strong departments where faculty are secure in their reputations and not cowed by tough external reviewers. It is important that the departmental faculty not choose the majority of the external reviewers. Letters of appointment to the reviewing representatives must convey that it is a college or central administration review. We have had modest success with this, but occasionally it becomes simply a process aimed at arguing for more funding without concomitant unit improvements.

2. Central university monitoring of course and program proliferation or perpetuation. Such features as the following are essential to keeping programs responsible fiscally:

- Minimum enrollment floors for sections and courses, with special provisions for approving occasional exceptions
- Tough curriculum committee review rather than the logrolling tendencies that can plague such operations
- Tough administrative review of all new programs, and, at each annual budget cycle, tough questions must be asked concerning continuation of any programs that have low productivity.

3. Cost analysis and comparison among institutions. In our situation, we find useful data exchanges in several comparison groups: Michigan Council of State College Presidents, special medical school reviews, and the Big Ten Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Such data as faculty salary levels, tenure ratios, unit costs of instruction, and related matters are most useful to evaluate where potential soft spots are located.

4. Conversion of the institutional budgeting processes into an effective management reporting system. We formerly had three processes that have now been combined into one. These three processes were preparation of departmental annual reports, preparation of asking budgets, and agreement on allocative or operative budget for each unit. We have designed this system to focus on the outputs of each unit in terms of both quantity and quality. Such outputs include instruction, research, extension, advising, administration, and public service.

From central administration, we also gave each unit a set of data on its inputs of funds, faculty, staff, and other resources as well as data on comparison of that unit with average college and institutional input/output ratios and such data as average class size, ratios of graduate students to undergraduates, and so on.

5. Resensitize the reward system to actually reward improvement. Salaries and promotions for faculty still tend to be strongly traditional, even archaic. They focus largely on quantitative scholarly output and intuitive quality judgements. We do need to address this matter with greater sophistication. By careful evaluation of overall departmental quality and comparison of its salary structure with similar departments in other institutions, some sense of rewarding of quality can be achieved. A pledge can be made to share dollars saved with the unit that makes tough decisions.
6. Tenure and retirement decisions. Tenure reviews and tenure ratios are sources of concern in unit management. Central administration can encourage such moves as shifting empty positions to visiting professors and approving hiring of lower ranks only. Early retirement on an individual basis with institutional initiative is useful. We have found that percent of salary budget for tenure stream vs. percent for visiting professors and temporary and teaching assistants is a good general way to look at faculty manpower.
7. Position control at the provost's level. This is essential to make many adjustments. All vacancies except those created by the unit's own decision not to recommend reappointment should revert to the dean for recommendation and to central administration for final decision.
8. Annual enrollment forecasting down to departmental levels is essential for anticipation of enrollment shifts. We have central university undergraduate admission. Departments have an input in admissions in a few departments such as music and nursing. At present, we have a 1,500 net enrollment shift per year, with colleges of social science, arts and letters, and education decreasing and natural science, human ecology, agriculture, and business increasing by the same number. This poses a tough problem on transfer of resources.

9. Training workshops for chairmen and assistant deans. We have found that rapidly changing federal practices and internal changes in management procedures require setting up workshops of various sorts. This needs more attention than we have given it.
10. Good research and development in instructional improvement. This is an area that has a potential payoff both in increasing productivity and improving instructional quality. It does need very good supervision, however. The units we have consolidated into one combined operation include: ITV, IMC, Learning Service, and Evaluation Services.
11. Reexamination of academic governance processes, grievance processes, and other departmental, college, and university level meetings that consume valuable time with, at best, marginal outputs and feelings of faculty frustration. Change in these units must have strong faculty participation, but administrators must also be involved from the president down through the vice presidents, deans, and department chairmen.
12. Continued attention must be devoted to the education of bureaucrats, legislators, boards of trustees, and the general public concerning the complexity of universities, but this must be accompanied with solid evidence of progress by the university, that it is meeting public needs and is improving institutional effectiveness. In Michigan, the general public is getting a very good bargain in higher education. In spite of substantial escalation of sophistication in faculty and in what must be taught, fewer noninflated dollars were spent per enrolled student in higher education in 1973-74 than in 1957 in all except medical colleges.
13. Continued attention must also be devoted to the education of faculty groups which sometimes perceive administrative concern for improved efficiency as representing an assault upon educational quality, if not academic freedom. I have long since ceased worrying that administrators tend to be viewed as being the problem by a small part of the faculty. This is inevitable and not much can be done about it. This must not be allowed to encourage chairmen, deans, or central administration to ignore genuine faculty concerns, however.
14. Alleviating disciplinary boundaries that become hurdles to improving academic program quality and efficiency is a major task that calls for much more attention than it gets. Some actions that help are increasing the number of joint appointments, having certain departments reporting to two or more colleges, and encouraging rotation among departments of faculty who are motivated to do so. In addition, some central administrative unit or units should address this challenge as a continuing part of its mission. Each of these actions generates other kinds of problems such as more complex bookkeeping, but we think the trade-off is worth it.

In closing, let me state my belief that universities, both large and small, continue to address the new challenges that stem from our voracious national appetite for competently trained and enlightened graduates, for new research and creative scholarship, and for learning how to bring useful information and insight from the ivy-covered halls out into the world where it can be put to work. With the growing challenges facing this nation and the entire human race, higher education has never had so much reason to be or so much reason to be optimistic. However, higher education is supported by the public not as a holding pattern of the affluent elite, but rather to deliver essential services. Universities are not societal luxuries in today's complex world. We, or something very closely like us, will continue to become even more essential to the continuation of man's culture. Our very culture, however, insists that we take this challenge seriously, that we alleviate waste, trivial puttering around, and territorial defense among units and get on with the job both society and we know we can and must do.

III. STRATEGIES

Planning for Quality

by

Earl B. Cheit, Associate Director
Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education

(summarized by J.N.N.)

Having looked at the problem in general and from the standpoint of several types of institutions, the conferences next looked more closely at the retrenchment phenomenon and its implications for academic quality and value, particularly in the personal and professional lives of faculty.

Dr. Earl Cheit, Professor at the University of California, Berkeley, and Associate Director of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, is well known for his work on the new depression in higher education. Under the title, "Planning for Quality," his emphasis was that planning never begins with a clean slate. There is always the clutter of history. He noted that the overwhelming preoccupation of higher education in the past decade has been with change. This is all the more significant when it is noted that the reason for change, the objectives to be reached through change, have seldom been discussed. Nor has the question of quality. A new opportunity has recently been opened to administrators and faculty members alike since it happens that hard decisions about money always get translated into questions of purposes and priorities.

A corollary of this emphasis on change has been the widespread notion that institutions have been unresponsive. Cheit says institutions have been far too responsive. But, responses have not always been well thought through or well planned, although suffused with conviction about purposes or concern for quality. He emphasized that rule one for successful planning is: "Know your institution's track record. What has been tried and with what success or failure?"

Lately, still another method of change is being urged on us: the application of systematic management to the educational enterprise. This effort helps facilitate the move toward whatever the objectives of the institution are, but gives no help in articulating what those objectives ought to be. Moreover, the implicit assumption is that the job is well done when a certain procedure is followed. Cheit rejects this notion and says that procedure does not and cannot guarantee quality or value. These are matters of philosophical and moral judgment.

Among his practical suggestions, Cheit urged that administrators be keenly aware that there has been a basic reversal of roles--whereas once it was faculty who planned and administrators who made tidy, it is now administrators who plan as they carry out the responsibility of managing the institution. This is always difficult but especially now because no faculty member feels or will admit the need to be managed.

Perhaps Cheit's most important point was that, ultimately, planning is faith. It is ultimate faith in the value of something you are working on to modify and improve. Planning efforts are not only a way to keep the faith but also to teach it. They produce the material administrators and fund raisers use when articulating the needs and aspirations of an institution to supporting constituencies.

The Supreme Role of Faculty in Planning:
Why and How?

by
David G. Brown, Provost
Miami University (Oxford)

With academic planners rests much of the future of higher education. Growth has too long been sporadic and scattered. It is high time that universities took more seriously the planning methods they teach. And it is our obligation to accept the responsibility for coordinating the best methods of planning known with the unique characteristics of the university. Herein lies a special opportunity and I am grateful to have it.

I have deep convictions about the necessary centrality of classroom faculty and line administrators in academic planning. Planning for faculty or about faculty or even with faculty is easier, more visible, more efficient, but it is also, I believe, less effective, often inane, usually unimplemented, and sometimes downright harmful. This opinion, reinforced by my personal experience in both private and public institutions, rests primarily upon two premises, the first relating to what is precious, unique, and distinctive about the university as contrasted to other institutions of society and the second relating to the means by which the comparative advantage of universities may be realized.

I shall begin with these premises. Consistent with these premises I shall go on to describe the role of the academic planning officer (who may well be the president or the chief academic officer in small institutions) as fourfold:

- to motivate faculty to plan for themselves
- to liberate faculty from traditional or habitual modes of thought
- to be a "fountain of knowledge" concerning new ways to extend faculty effectiveness
- to provide structures and organizational formats that allow an institution, or part of an institution, to revise and redirect its plans with minimum effort

As each of these four roles is identified, I shall list a number of things to do to implement the role. The lists are, of course, meant to be beginnings.

Premise Number One

The most distinctive organizational characteristic of universities is their bottom-heavy authority, their decentralized decision making, their strong reliance upon the judgments of individual faculty members.

The preservation of this type of structure is essential to the efficient and effective pursuit of the university's basic mission: to wit, to facilitate discovery and personal growth.

The university is a specialized institution in society. It is structured to complete successfully tasks that are essentially non-repetitive and often not clearly definable.

The university is not at all good at implementing a narrowly defined goal, unlike business corporations, labor unions, and governmental agencies. In such hierarchical organizations it is assumed that the higher a person is on the pyramid, the better his ability to judge, either because his abilities have been proven at a lower level, because he has more information and a broader perspective, or because he has more experience. The university is one of the very few organizations in society that accepts the chaos that naturally grows out of the belief that the judgment of the people on the firing line (the faculty) is superior to the judgment of top management.

As a result, universities have found their comparative advantage in pursuing endeavors that benefit from a bottom-heavy authority structure. These tasks tend to be very personal, such as assisting a particular individual to grow (as in a university) or keeping an individual person in good health (as in a hospital, where the doctor's authority exceeds the authority of the hospital's top management). These tasks tend to be very deviant, such as a researcher pursuing a byway that everyone else believes to be unproductive or a philosopher moralizing on an issue that places the majority in a bad light.

As is the case in any properly functioning competitive society, historical circumstance has allocated to the university the responsibility for performing those tasks that are best performed in a highly decentralized, bottom-heavy organization.

The planning process adopted by a university must enhance its basic organizational characteristic: to wit, a bottom-heavy authority structure that is substantially decentralized. The university's mission is to facilitate discovery and personal growth. The process of discovering and growing are highly personal, individualistic, deviant. The planning process must, therefore, enable and enhance these types of behavior.

To adopt a centralized planning strategy is to destroy what is precious in a university, to annihilate an institutional alternative in society, to eliminate the university's one comparative advantage, to doom universities as we know them today to extinction.

Premise Number Two

Planning decisions cannot and should not be separated from today's decisions, for all decisions have consequences for tomorrow. Planning must therefore be an integral part of an institution's life. Realistic planning must be dominated by the people who make decisions for today.

An independent planning office is appropriate only if it takes the most subservient role.

Three stereotypic planners can be identified. The first planner is the author of the long-range plan. He writes the plan. The plan is his. His full-time and only job is to envision, anticipate, and implement the future. Although his ideas must be formally ratified by the official decision maker, such as the president, the ratification is perfunctory and the plan is not of the president but of the planner. Such a planning process is feasible and perhaps desirable when a single-objective mission is widely accepted and when the planner is able to develop a knowledge and expertise roughly comparable to that of the individuals throughout the organization.

The second stereotypic planner is one who nurtures the development of a planning document through intimate consultation with many experts. The planner typically determines the format of expression of the plan. The model is less centralized than the first stereotype but more centralized than the third stereotype. This is the type of planning that occurs in most organizations.

The third stereotypic planner is a facilitator and technical advisor, a resource person. He has no authority. His planning role is defined by others coming to him. Others determine the objective of their planning and ask for advice on how their plans might be implemented. In this model the planner is an extremely valuable person who increases the productivity and successfulness of others as they plan.

My second premise is that the third stereotypic planner is the only one acceptable within the academic community of a university. The tradition of faculty senates and the reality of the wide distribution of highly specialized expertise mean that, except in the most authoritarian universities, another type of planner will be drafting documents that are never adopted. The actions of virtually all universities reflect a strong conviction that planning should be dominated by similarly trained individuals in department-like groups and that the administration should facilitate rather than determine plans.

We know how to plan when an organization accepts the centralized authority of the top figure in a hierarchy. The challenge of academic planning and of this conference is to determine ways in which individual institutions can plan when the primary authority rests somewhere in the middle of the hierarchy. We thus start with the premise that planning must be with the faculty and by the faculty, not for the faculty.

Universities should be dominated by faculty and students. Administrative planning by grand scheme is ineffective and dysfunctional except in those colleges and universities intending radical change. For educational and political reasons, planning must be incremental, decentralized, and a primary responsibility of each professor.

Planner as Facilitator

In my hypothetical university, the person titled planning officer is a facilitator, a catalyst, a resource person, an advocate of planning, a collator and coordinator of a total statement of aspirations and firm intents. He is not the author of a plan, an imposer of structure. He is in the model of a department chairman, dean, or provost who proceeds more through the power of persuasion and the quality of his ideas than through the authority of his position.

Planner as Motivator

Many wonderful words have been said about the power of faculty and the importance of that power. Have you noticed the silence regarding the success of faculty in planning?

Like all of us, faculty tend to put off thinking about the long range in order to respond to the crisis of the moment. Every planning officer must take positive steps to motivate faculty to plan. Faculty must believe that planning is important, that planning is an unavoidable responsibility and a positive opportunity, that planning is to be recognized, honored, and rewarded, and (if such is the case) that new dollars will not be available no matter how good the idea. Faculty must be imbued with the deep conviction that planning is critical, that planning without faculty is inferior, and that planning with new dollars is truly unrealistic.

Let me begin several lists of "how to's" by suggesting ways the planning facilitator may motivate faculty.

1. Persuade faculty that others cannot do it for them. All of us need to be reminded of the special and relatively distinctive bottom-powerful hierarchy. The two planning premises mentioned earlier need to be articulated frequently and the obligation forced upon faculty in such a structure. Articulating that the alternative to faculty planning is central planning helps. Circulating a grand scheme developed without faculty involvement from another university, preferably nearby and comparable, can sometimes frighten faculty into action.
2. Highlight local exemplars of good planning. Why not honor the good plan and flatter the good planner by providing wide distribution to the effort and its results? Why not share local anecdotes about the desirable consequences of a particular planning effort?
3. Circulate examples of planning efforts that do not require prodigious quantities of time. Raise the confidence of the faculty member in his ability to plan by highlighting the planning he is already doing. The avoidance of professional planning jargon will help.
4. Make visible the planning efforts of top administrative officials.

5. Send faculty leaders to off-campus seminars regarding the value of faculty planning, such as this seminar. Why not circulate this paper and others like it? Why not invite a consultant to speak on the value of planning at the regular departmental and college meetings of faculty and perhaps arrange in advance for a local panel of faculty to comment on the remarks?
6. Respond to planning reports. How can we in good conscience plead for faculty to pour precious energy into planning when so many faculty planning reports end in file drawers? Faculty will give time and effort only to the extent that there are visible effects. No one wants to write reports that won't be read.
7. Share financial data. Faculty will not plan until convinced that resources are limited, that there is no pot of gold in overspending on athletics or underfunding.
8. Refuse to plan for faculty. Some faculty will let a staff planner do it for them. Don't.
9. Designate community-wide times for planning. Perhaps you might like to try an all-campus planning week, to highlight the phenomenon of everyone planning for the year ahead during the week prior to the first class, to publicize every Wednesday afternoon as a special time to be devoted to planning activity.
10. Convene a weekly meeting of individuals who are currently most interested in faculty planning so that these faculty can reinforce each others' commitments and share information.
11. Pay a one time only special achievement bonus of, say, \$300 to the ten percent of the faculty judged by a committee to be doing the finest job or making the most effort in planning. A corrolary to this suggestion is to award several departments supplemental funds, to be spent at the discretion of the departmental faculty for department-wide planning efforts.
12. Might we not try a special fund for buying released time to plan for a department? For example, the planner might be awarded a budget that would allow him to hire a part-time instructor to replace a faculty member who is mutually designated by the department and the planning officer to develop a departmental plan.
13. How about awarding faculty a special title, such as fellow in the institute of planning, and access to special clerical support to pursue a proposal judged to be of promise?
14. Wouldn't the provision of a summer award (for example, \$1,000 stipends) on a competitive basis to those who, by the judgment of a faculty committee or the planning officer, submit the most promising proposals increase planning?

15. Annual review. At Miami we require each faculty member to submit materials relevant to an annual evaluative session with his department chairman. One submission is an open-ended statement on the objectives to be accomplished during the upcoming year and, if desired, subsequent years. By paying attention to these statements during the conference and referring back to the quality of the statements when arguing for salary increment and promotion, the chairman can impress their significance and the value he assigns to them.

We must go on to the second role of the planning officer, and I have run out of ideas. Perhaps you can extend the list.

Planner as Liberator

With faculty and all other planners, a primary challenge is to enable thinking beyond the present, beyond a mere extrapolation of present trends. If an institution is to involve its entire faculty and staff in thinking about the future, it must also enable the breaking of habitual thinking patterns for the entire staff.

To facilitate breaking habitual thinking there are at least three strategies.

The first is to provide access to new information. Information flows become routinized. People tend to read the same newspapers, watch the same television programs, and go to the same conventions year after year.

Can we not challenge and often break this cycle?

16. By providing free subscriptions to periodicals such as The Chronicle of Higher Education
17. By highlighting selected journal articles through free distribution
18. By forming luncheon discussion groups
19. By sponsoring faculty colloquia in which capsulized presentations of new thoughts and seldom seen activities can be made available to faculty (for example, a short course on programming)
20. By encouraging faculty to visit the classes of colleagues
21. By facilitating the auditing of courses among faculty
22. By incorporating thoughts about the future in the president's annual address to the faculty
23. By circulating among faculty offices several of the leading publications in the futuristic literature

24. By initiating a special newsletter on teaching innovations and planning techniques or by designating a special column in the house organ for carrying a description of successful planning efforts and innovations elsewhere
25. By videotaping a successful teaching improvement
26. By designating a group of younger faculty with the special responsibility to inform their colleagues of the most recent pedagogical and research-methodology developments
27. By publishing a faculty vitae book to make faculty aware of those on their home campus with interests similar to their own

The second strategy for challenging traditional thinking patterns is to present new tasks for the purpose of exposure. For example:

28. An administrative assignment may be given to a faculty member during the summer.
29. A course may be taught on a team teaching basis.
30. Course teaching assignments may be switched around.
31. Committee assignments may be rotated.

The third strategy is to provide new environments. This is both the most traditional and most promising method of breaking habitual thinking. Traditionally, faculty have attended conferences and conventions as a means of self-development and growth. Sabbaticals are traditional, though under attack because of their relative inefficiency. An aggressive administration can encourage the development of new environments:

32. By paying the moving and dislocation costs of faculty exchanges among universities
33. By routinely approving leaves of absence without pay
34. By negotiating faculty exchanges with foreign universities
35. By being willing to continue the salary of a faculty member who is temporarily assigned to another campus if the other campus is willing to exchange a faculty member without charge
36. By encouraging faculty in different departments to switch teaching loads
37. By informing and coaching faculty regarding competition for Fulbrights and other national awards
38. By joining the several national faculty information exchanges

39. By providing funds to bring distinguished speakers to campus
40. By initiating artist-in-residence or executive-in-residence programs
41. By sponsoring interdisciplinary colloquia within the campus
42. By urging faculty to attend different conferences each year rather than returning to the same conference year after year
43. By forming advisory committees of alumni and professionals in each disciplinary department grouping
44. By encouraging some faculty to take office for one year only within another department
45. By explicitly focusing the sabbatical time via the requirement of a report at the end of the sabbatical that indicates what a faculty member thinks he or she should do differently in light of the likely future developments in the field
46. By funding "look-see" trips to other campuses where there are ongoing experiments
47. By encouraging the faculty to locate alternative summer employment in industry or at another university
48. By hiring outside consultants to visit with local faculty

By now I hope you are convinced that there are many procedures by which the planning officer can break habitual thinking through faculty development. At this very moment there is a great deal of interest within foundations and the government, as well as within institutions themselves, in the concept of faculty development and environment change. Many of you I am sure will have much to add to my beginning list.

Planner as Resource Person

The same faculty members who are superbly prepared to anticipate future trends and needs in the subject matter of their disciplines are typically woefully uneducated about planning and implementation methodologies. They know, for example, that a new theory of aerodynamics will revolutionize their discipline, but they do not know how to translate this impact into concrete futures.

It is here that the facilitating planner can assume the very valuable role of resource person, of special consultant. For the majority of faculty who will not and should not take the time to become specialized in planning procedures and techniques, the availability of advice from one who is so specialized can be invaluable.

As the planner prepares for his role as resource, he might:

49. Conduct special seminars on planning techniques
50. Maintain a file of teaching and research-methodology innovations by discipline, including innovations such as the Kellar Plan
51. Make available canned computer programs that can be used to evaluate the success or failure of various instructional techniques
52. Survey faculty, students, and alumni regarding their educational experiences through a routine questionnaire
53. Query all students upon entry and exit
54. Develop diaries of departmental planning procedures and circulate them
55. Publish an annual list of printed materials available
56. Maintain an up-to-date file of all planning efforts within the university
57. Design and maintain a general data system that may be used in planning and evaluating various endeavors
58. Attend seminars and read widely
59. Initiate planning conversations with influential faculty leaders

Again, this is only a beginning list. Here especially your help is needed to fill in.

Planner as Coordinator

Up to this very late point in my presentation I have advocated a totally decentralized approach to planning. The planning officer is the facilitator, the catalyst, the resource person, the liberator.

However, total decentralization may well lead to chaos, to a series of nonreconcilable plans based on noncomparable assumptions phrased in different format and language. It is the obligation of the planning officer to provide a framework and a vocabulary within which all faculty can plan and to articulate some basic parameters upon which faculty projections can be based.

Because faculty planning equations are insolvable when too many variables are unknown, the planning officer in close consultation with the faculty should postulate matters such as tuition rates, income

levels, enrollment changes, and building availability. It is then and only then that attention can be meaningfully focused by the faculty on the crucial elements of curriculum, learning methodologies, and the like.

Another equally important central responsibility of the planning officer is to provide the framework for all-university planning, both the big picture and the linkage among individual planning units. I have some very specific thoughts and suggestions regarding this general framework.

My conviction is that the truly clairvoyant planner recognizes that the future is above all uncertain. The highest challenge for the university planner is to design a system for planning, a system that allows the efficient pursuit of objective A in 1974 without preempting the possibility of pursuing with equal efficiency a totally different objective in 1977. The challenge to the academic planner is to facilitate today's decisions while accounting for tomorrow's realities without limiting tomorrow's opportunities.

The planning system should provide, first and foremost, flexibility and the ability to make a midcourse correction. Every plan is out-of-date before the ink is dry. Revision, reevaluation, rethinking, updating must be a built-in feature of every planning system, and it is the responsibility of the planning officer to assure this flexibility.

Among the several general procedures a university may adopt to assure such reevaluation are the following:

60. The loose-leaf planning notebook
61. Outside consultants
62. Periodic ad hoc task forces

The now outworn concept of the ten-year master plan may wisely be replaced by the loose-leaf notebook. Within the notebook, whose loose leaves are symbolic of planning flexibility, are contained the individual aspirations and plans of each department, each college, each sector of the university. At any time a unit, at its own initiative, may update its plan by simply requesting the planning officer to replace pages dated 1972 with pages dated 1974. The planning officer, if desired, may take responsibility for checking on the currency of plans, perhaps every three years.

Outside consultants rarely have the right answers but they often ask the correct questions. The primary advantage of the outside consultant, whether viewing the program of a department within the university or the university as a whole, is the fresh perspective. In my judgment, no major decision should be made without the benefit of an outside consultant. Consultants add perspective, an element of disinterest, and an authenticity to plans. Often it is helpful to bring in a consultant who is commonly agreed upon in advance. Always it is important to evaluate the relevance of the advice given in terms of the local circumstances.

The strategy of ad hoc planning task forces is to tap faculty and students active in the classroom for a one-shot planning effort that is university-wide. In this manner planning avoids bureaucratization. The university using this technique will find some reason to appoint a blue ribbon group of faculty every two or three years. The groups will always be asked to examine institutional direction, and to make recommendations on new directions. The excuse for the biennium may be the inauguration of a new president, his decade anniversary, a decennial accreditation review, a cost cutting squeeze, student concern as expressed in active protest, and investigation by the legislature, a report from an outside consultant, or a charge to upgrade the general quality of effort. The excuse is not important. What is important is the concept that every two or three years there will be an all-institution review, assessment, and forward projection. Each time the personnel and the perspective will be fresh.

In order to adopt the new ideas generated by these flexible planning mechanisms, flexibility must be built into staffing arrangements, curriculum procedures, and the organizational structure.

A university committed to staffing flexibility may consider:

63. Longer probationary periods for faculty
64. Distribution of information about tenure percentages, models that project upcoming percentages by departments, and in extreme instances mandates on tenure quotas
65. Positions that are explicitly temporary and not within the tenure tract
66. Early retirement or partial retirement, preferably through special arrangements that minimize the individual financial consequences of early retirement
67. Adjunct and visiting professorships
68. Part-time professorships and emergency funding for last minute needs
69. Periodic review of all administrative positions including the position of academic planner

Curricular flexibility may be provided by:

70. Allowing any course to be taught under an experimental number on a one-time basis
71. Requiring each department to purge 20 percent of its courses each year
72. Providing that no course may be taught for more than five consecutive years

73. Building in procedures that call for the review of the total curriculum every three to five years

74. Switching academic calendars periodically

Organizational flexibility may be provided by:

75. Forming temporary institutes that may not exist for more than five years

76. Merging departments so that disciplinary specialists can make their own trade-offs

77. Making joint appointments across several departments

78. Founding new schools and colleges

79. Funding an institute for teaching innovation and institutional vitality

Conclusion

Mine is the old-fashioned idea that modern management methodologies should be used to increase the decision effectiveness of decentralized and loosely coordinated planning. The single-minded university mimics other societal institutions such as business corporations. The participatory university mimics other societal institutions such as city governments and labor unions. The decentralized university, with effective planning responsibility at the bottom of the hierarchy, is truly distinctive. The unique, decentralized university is the one most worth preserving. Here the risk is chaos and inefficiency, but it is not misguided purpose and political takeover.

Fiscal Structures and Institutional Decision Making

by

P. Lawrence Hester
Associate Director of Fiscal Planning
Vanderbilt University

The environment surrounding fiscal structures for higher education has changed considerably in the past three years. The pace of that change has recently increased with several outputs already impacting strongly on a large number of institutions. Additional outputs are on the immediate horizon, and all institutions will soon be affected.

We have entered an era of open decision making, an age of consumerism. The pressures bearing on fiscal structure relate to consumerism. Some of the pressures are new to us, but most are simply a sign of the times wherein value received is subject to open debate. The consumers in higher education are a diverse group, but they can be viewed in this context as those who finance our institutions.

A large number of institutions do not actively consider students as a major funding source. This is undoubtedly a result of the students' lack of cohesion as a market force. No single student represents a major source of funds and cannot, therefore, exert pressure on the structure of the institutions. However, it is a critical error to ignore students as a fiscal source.

Taxpayers as a funding source suffer a similar fate as individuals, but they can exert tremendous pressures through legislators. At the state level, few legislatures have been willing to pay the cost of developing full information systems for understanding the intricacies of higher education. Only in recent years have many legislatures decided that such information is a necessity and pushed for development of systems.

The federal government represents the most focused source of consumerism and has taken an increasingly active role in information gathering.

There are three specific projects in varying stages of completion that represent major attempts to gather and use information about higher education. They are of extreme importance in that the change in information flow that will result from these developments will affect the general perception of institutional finances and place large amounts of additional information in the hands of consumers.

The first project is the Program Classification Structure (PCS), a product of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), funded in the main by the Office of Education. The PCS provides for the classification of institutional activities into seven basic categories:

1. Instruction
2. Organized Research

3. Public Service
4. Academic Support
5. Student Support
6. Institutional Support
7. Independent Operations

Each category is subdivided into special areas. For example, the Instruction Program is subcategorized as follows:

1. General Academic Instruction
2. Occupational and Vocational Instruction
3. Special Session Instruction
4. Extension Instruction (for credit)

The subprograms are further divided into more specific areas, with the Instruction Program using the HEGIS taxonomy to indicate academic disciplines. Additional data elements in the Instruction Program allow for the data detail to include a subdiscipline, the level of course offering, and the specific section of a course.

This Program Classification Structure is the heart of an information system that is to include student data, faculty activity data, financial data, space inventory and utilization data, and staff assignment data. It is designed to allow program budgeting, cost/benefit analysis, inter-institutional data exchange, the development of analytical models of institutional operations, and the development of unit cost data.

The 1973 HEGIS report requested that some data be supplied to the Office of Education in the PCS format. This will increasingly be the case.

The second major project underway is the Joint Accounting Group (JAG) study of institutional accounting categories. The JAG is composed of three representatives from the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), three from the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), and three from NCHEMS. Their task is to reconsider the structure used in recording financial data as it relates to the production of audited financial statements at institutions of higher education.

The changes recommended by the JAG are closely related to the PCS program categories. Two of the three component organizations have endorsed the report. The activities of this group are in addition to the changes in accounting procedures incorporated in the latest AICPA guide for auditing colleges and universities.

The third major project is the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, as established in the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. The Commission has made its report (Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States) and the Commissioner of Education has formally responded to the recommendations. A major task for the Commission was to be the development of uniform standards, by type of institution, for determining the annual cost per student for postsecondary education. While the Commission did not specify such standards, its report states that the determination of uniform national standards is feasible, and the Commission staff suggested interim procedures in an accompanying staff paper ("A Proposal: Interim National Standard Procedures for Deriving Per-Student Costs in Postsecondary Educational Institutions").

Commissioner Ottina's response to Congress on the recommendations is in line with the Commission's general theme, that the suggested interim procedures would not be acceptable on a permanent basis and that any institutional reporting on the basis of the procedures should be voluntary.

These projects, and other external forces, may change your internal management. Higher education institutions have been like jigsaw puzzles. We have reluctantly shown individual pieces to outsiders, but we have never shown the box covers to anyone. Confluent projects are determining a methodology for fitting the pieces together in some fashion, even without benefit of the cover pictures. That the resultant consumer view of our institutions may not correspond to our own view portends a new era of management.

State awards of monies for higher education are basically unrestricted. There is increasing pressure on the federal government to award unrestricted funds to colleges and universities. Such awards have been made in medical areas through capitation and disaster assistance grants. The award of unrestricted funds to an institution inevitably leads to increased reporting requirements. Such requirements are without meaning unless they result in program costing. As mentioned above, the system's capacity to cast such data into program and unit costs is increasing rapidly. The publication of program and unit cost data would greatly increase pressures for differential pricing of programs (and by student level within programs).

The award of direct program support monies will be based on actual documented direct and indirect costs. This will require a formal procedure for the allocation of support activity costs (indirect) into primary program activities (direct). Such a procedure currently exists for the allocation of research support costs (OMB Circular A-21). A similar procedure will be needed for instruction and public service programs. NCHEMS is active in this area through the Cost Finding Principles project.

All of these external influences will require institutional managers increasingly to defend elements of the institution, often to the exclusion of any concept of the whole. This is the jigsaw puzzle problem. Higher education administrators will be overwhelmed by the elemental approach unless they have a clear and studied concept of how each piece fits into the whole. Critical concentrations of understanding lie in the areas of:

- 1) scholarly inquiry by the faculty as it relates to instruction and formal research;
- 2) the relationship of support activities to activities supported;
- 3) the "joint products" issue of graduate education (for example, instructional

credit for graduate research projects); and 4) the primary (that is, nonsupport) outcome of support programs, particularly student life activities. Meaningful progress in the area of cost/benefit analysis will be forthcoming only after long, hard work. The NCHEMS Program Measures project is working in this area. The lack of meaningful outcome data for individual data elements, such as a specific course offering, will cause great headaches when the cost of the element is known.

A Positive Side

A positive side to these events lies in the increased understanding of institutional interworkings that must be gained by managers. In a time of constrained financial resources, an increased knowledge of interrelationships will allow for better planning and management. Certain management needs are more clearly perceived under financial pressures. Among them are the following:

1. The relationships of support activities to activities supported must be established. Unproductive dialogue concerning the drain that support activities place on academic budgets must be controlled. Planned changes in primary activities must also address the effect on support operations (computers and libraries are the best examples).
2. The scale economics of the institution must be known.
3. All commitments must be formally recorded and sources of funds specified.
4. The impact of external price changes upon institutional expenditures must be known.
5. Institutions dependent upon tuition and private gifts must know the financial market of their students and benefactors.
6. The financial picture of the institution must be accurately projected sufficiently far in advance that all commitments will be made in the light of the economic context and insure that academic planning is not lost in crisis management. The financial picture must include costs that will be incurred in building renovations and replacement of equipment.
7. A meaningful flow of financial information to the faculty must be established. The fiscal dynamics must be clear to the faculty before faculty participation in institutional decision making can be meaningful. In most colleges and universities, the faculty members are the chief fund raisers. The understanding of financial dynamics includes knowledge of the process whereby faculty efforts cause funds to flow into the institution (tuition, credit-hour funding, capitation allowances, research grants, and so on) and how these funds can either increase normal operating expenses or help offset routine expenses.

The development of unit cost information, and its publication, will result in increased attention to the financial bottom line. The decisions made about that line will be hard ones. Hard decisions must be supported with both dynamic understanding of the institution and adequate data. Before such decisions can be made, the institution must conquer its data base. This includes deciding on the composition of units that will be used in arriving at a bottom line. Conquest of the data base means:

1. The availability of data is known and gaps can be filled without resorting to a mass central data collection project.
2. The data are understood, particularly interrelationships among data elements.
3. The data can be screened for appropriate application to the problem at hand without saturation of decision makers.
4. The response time is realistic to the problem under consideration.
5. Most data are automatically collected as a byproduct of routine operations.

Planning of any nature--academic, financial, space--can have impact on the organization only through relationships with systems of management. As such, systems of management, including financial structures, should address the planning element. A formal separation of planning from routine management can be disastrous.

In financial structures, there is a continuum between pooled income and full cost centering (that is, "each tub on its own bottom"). Neither end point is realistic. Pooled income concentrates all fund-raising incentives away from the faculty. The "tub" approach is antithetical to the university and ignores the large range of opportunities that may cross boundaries.

A different point on the continuum will be appropriate to different institutions and may be appropriate to the same institution at different points in its life. The chosen point on the continuum may be affected by the skills of the administrators, or the appointment of administrators may be affected by the desired point on the continuum. The institution's stage of development (developing, major expansion, steady state, or declining) plays a major role in the concentration or decentralization of authority.

The Parceling Out of Management: Program Funding

This leads to a question: How should university management be parceled out? The question is institution-specific but criteria include the following:

1. To provide the most effective service to constituents.
2. To provide incentives for management and fund raising.
3. To establish responsibilities.

4. To focus management issues.
5. To maximize effective participation in decision making.
6. To concentrate the data elements, and move away from a line focus toward program considerations.
7. To expose the economics of the institution.

I submit that the answer to this question lies with a program funding approach. In this context, a program might be student life, executive administration, or undergraduate instruction. These program units become planning units and each has a bottom line. In determining what the program units should be, two things are important: cohesion of the units within a program and a single individual responsible for the program in its entirety. It is my opinion that individual responsibility is more important than cohesion. Such organization is necessary to provide for trade-offs among data elements within the program. The adoption of program units may indicate needed changes in organizational structure.

Once the program units are defined, income should be assigned to each unit. Such funding should be tied to the activities supported and, when possible, to the level of activity. This is usually given inadequate attention in the area of support programs. There are essentially two approaches to funding program units: the distribution of expense or the distribution of income. The distribution of expense is quite common in practice and is almost invariably viewed within the institution as a drain on resources belonging to primary programs. The distribution of income approach, if implemented properly, should be seen as recognizing the intent of funding agencies (including students) to cover a variety of expenses with a single payment. In a program funding system where income is shared, there is a meshing of authority, responsibility, and accountability.

The institution should move to support a program system with planning and evaluation. Formal systems should exist for both planning and evaluation, and realistic lead times are necessary for effective incorporation of such systems into day-to-day management. The annual budgeting cycle is not sufficient to address a program structure and evaluation of programs. I suggest that only a long-run approach, perhaps with the thorough evaluation of one or two programs per year, will lead to the best concentration of efforts.

Money at the Center

All of this proposes a highly decentralized system. A key element to be addressed in such a decentralized system is the need for money at the center. Such money should be part of the ongoing finances of the institution.

There are many reasons for providing money at the center. Some of these are:

1. To provide venture capital. In a time of constrained resources, there is often "old guard" resistance to innovation. Innovation is seen as a drain of resources away from traditional programs, the "heart of the institution." If such monies are built into the system there is less opportunity for this view. In addition, venture opportunities may cross program boundaries. While each unit might budget its own capital, the pooling of such funds usually allows for better decisions and provides a mechanism for projects too large for individual units.
2. To balance the budget. It is likely that each program unit will incur ups and downs financially. There are flows of student interest, there are flows of governmental interest, and there are definitely flows of foundation interest. One should always push for these swings to be managed within the finances of the program unit, understanding that this might not be possible. Some units may have only downs and no ups, but they may be necessary for the completeness of the institution. When a unit proves to have only downs, a major decision is necessary. If the program is of high value to the institution, some attempt should be made to provide additional permanent financing rather than continually using central discretionary funds.
3. To provide major-expense contingency. This again is a pooling phenomenon, designed to avoid crisis management. The pooling phenomenon and avoiding crisis management recognize that crises will occur at different points, but that there will always be some problem.
4. To provide a fund-raising incentive. Such monies can often be used for incentive grants (matching money). This includes formal matching on grants and contracts as well as an incentive to raise endowment funds.
5. To avoid cost distribution questions. This is not a good use, but is quite widely employed.

There are several important characteristics to central discretionary funds. The key element is that they be renewed routinely as a regular part of financial operations. Secondly, the application must be time limited, particularly when one is in a no-growth financial situation. Historically, applications of central funds have not needed to be time limited because institutional resources continued to grow and new discretionary funds replaced the old funds now built into the operating base. If the support of a program is not to be time limited, permanent funding should be used. Such permanent funding could involve the temporary (ten years) use of permanent funds, that is, an assignable endowment.

There are good ways and bad ways to generate a central pool of funds. One way is to set aside some portion of endowment income, particularly if the institution has some fair amount of funds functioning as endowment. It might also be possible to raise a discretionary endowment, with the appeal linked to the resultant ability for the institution to avoid crisis management and engage in exciting new ventures.

A third method of finding central monies is to divide operational income, taking one percent of all revenues or one percent of tuition income, for example. This is not a drain on primary funds since, in the long run, it is assumed that crisis and venture applications will average out across program boundaries.

The fourth method is to take all unrestricted gifts at the central level and pledge them to this purpose rather than to operations. Another idea would be to pledge the earnings on the investment of cash flow.

Within all the elements of financial structures that have been mentioned, each college and university should find several appropriate to its own current situation. From these elements a clearer planning and management system should be constructed. I again stress that various structures are appropriate at different points in an institution's life. There is also a value to change, stemming from the increased understanding of the institution gained in the process. For this reason alone, periodic consideration should be given to alternative approaches.

For a review of several leads of complete planning and management systems, I recommend that you read Strategies for Budgeting, ed. by George Kaludis. (New Directions for Higher Education, Number 2, Summer 1973; San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.).

The ideas contained in this paper represent joint efforts with Dr. George Kaludis, Vice Chancellor for Operations and Fiscal Planning at Vanderbilt University. Responsibility for the presentation herein lies solely with the author.

IV. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENTS

The View from Washington

by

Virginia B. Smith

Director, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

This last year as Director of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, I have had the unusual opportunity of reviewing a total of 4,000 proposals of what institutions wish to do to improve themselves. From such a vantage point, it is possible to see most encouraging signs of vitality and health in the nation's postsecondary system, in spite of pervasive financial concerns. It is inevitable, however, that the same vantage point affords a view of many problems, problems which may make it difficult for the signs of vitality to come to fullest fruition. I wish to discuss a number of these problems with you this morning.

In the 1950's and 1960's we engaged in a revolution in access to higher education. The relative success of that revolution brought greatly heightened visibility for higher education budgets. Not only did the costs grow because of the 100 percent increase in enrollment in a little over a decade, but costs per student also rose sharply. These two upward pressures led to a dramatic increase in the total impact of higher education costs on the nation's budget. In 1960, about one percent of the Gross National Product went for higher education expenditures. By 1970 the percentage had risen to 2.5. What had been relatively minor expenditures in state budgets had now become very noticeable items.

Against this background, it is understandable that higher education cost analysis is almost becoming a new national pastime. We are hearing about cost per student, cost per degree, cost per credit hour. We have heard those who wish to develop a standard unit cost for segments of higher education. But so far there is little agreement on the precise magical unit that could be used as the basis for this type of cost analysis. Although recognizing that it is a bit premature to mandate a system of standard unit cost accounting, the recent report of the Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education did recommend a voluntary use of the NCHEMS approach. And certainly this effort might have benefit as a first level general management tool. It is, however, hard to see unit cost accounting by itself as a valuable tool for public accountability or policymaking. For these purposes, we would need a cost-effectiveness ratio, unless, of course, we can safely assume all educational activities are equal in benefit and therefore interchangeable. If this were true, we would only need agreement on some gross unit and cost analysis based on that unit. I doubt that any of us would agree with an assumption of interchangeability, and yet we are behaving exactly as though we do. Our efforts to analyze cost have proceeded much farther and gained considerably more sophistication than our efforts to measure effectiveness. As a result, it is understandable that policymakers frequently find themselves relying on cost figures alone as a basis for decisions.

Why is it that we have failed to measure effectiveness? What might be done to move in that direction? What are the problems in moving in that direction? First of all, it should be pointed out that failure to

measure effectiveness consciously doesn't mean that it isn't being done. In some cases it is being done for higher education and in some cases it is being done by sections of higher education.

It is being done on the very simplest level. After all, anyone who hires college graduates, or observes them in various roles, is probably making some connection between that college graduate's performance and the quality of his education. That, perhaps, is the deepest measure of effectiveness of college education. It is continuing observation in many situations, by many people. Without advantage of a systematic approach, and without any aggregation of conclusions, it is, nonetheless, a measure of effectiveness of college education which forms one basis for judgment in the minds of many of us.

Our effectiveness is also being measured along somewhat different dimensions. In this nation, we have been concerned about initial access to higher education, and implicitly it is used as one dimension of effectiveness. But foreign observers, comparing their nation's higher education system with ours, think of access in terms that are somewhat different from ours. For instance, Sir Eric Ashby of England, in an essay on American education, pointed out that although we deal in very, very large numbers in terms of access to institutions, England does about as well as the United States if educational opportunity is defined in terms of degrees achieved at the bachelor's level. While 50 percent of the college age group has initial access in the United States compared to 20 percent of this age group in England, our attrition rate is much higher than England's. A 20 percent bachelor's degree attainment level in this nation compares with a 14 percent figure in England. The dimensions along which effectiveness is measured should reflect the values of the nation. It is probably inappropriate to measure education in this country only in terms of bachelor's degrees. But since we haven't been particularly articulate about what we want measured, we're fair game for the application of a variety of available measures which may or may not represent what we consciously believe to be the most important dimensions of our system.

Studies comparing retention rates of students in occupational programs in private trade schools with retention rates for students in community colleges suggest that community colleges have lower retention rates. Spokesmen for community colleges point out, however, that their purpose is not retention within a given occupational program. One of their measures of success, it is argued, should be the ability of the student to shop around, to look at different kinds of vocational programs, then move on to others. In other words, what the community college representative was saying is that effectiveness was being measured on the wrong scale.

If, indeed, our goal is to permit students to explore and examine alternatives for career choice, then we need to assess effectiveness along that dimension. Then attention shifts from retention to effectiveness of the community college technique of providing exposure to a number of occupational choices. Is it reasonable to assume, without further analysis, that permitting the student to dip into particular instructional programs for brief periods of time is one of the most effective ways to

make that choice? It is important to remember, however, that those who identified "shopping around" as a goal did not do so to stimulate analysis of effectiveness, but rather to negate the relevance of some other effectiveness assessment measure.

The higher education community has, for the most part, taken a similar stance on Christopher Jenks' recent view. In general we argue that Jenks is attempting to judge the success of our system on outcomes it never promised. Whether or not this is the case, it is clear that our reaction to Jenks' efforts was in the usual mode, a negation of the assessment, and failure to suggest aggressively a more relevant assessment approach. In a sense, our failure to provide the framework for effectiveness is the greatest strength of those who wish to move toward an efficiency approach, a standard unit cost approach, without reference to the quality of the outcomes.

It is perhaps a bit misleading to say that we are not consciously measuring effectiveness. In several ways, we are. For instance, in many of our colleges we have readily available figures on how many of our Ph.D.'s have moved into teaching jobs in prestigious institutions. Our willingness to measure along these dimensions gives signals that these are the only values in higher education to which we give importance. By failing to talk about effectiveness in other terms, we are in a sense selling our institutions on highly restricted, very narrow vocational kinds of grounds. Because of that, we may increasingly find that others accept this view and assume therefore that manpower concerns should shape the size and nature of the higher education system. Most of us in this room would reject the notion that this nation's higher education systems should be driven by manpower models. Yet, we have not developed many credible ways of demonstrating other dimensions of effectiveness beyond vocational impact.

This is true even in the liberal arts. Particularly in the liberal arts we seem to be left with quality measures like "how many of our graduates go on to graduate school" which we generally see as farthest removed from vocational concerns, and this is a vocational question. One could argue that some of our liberal arts programs are the most vocational programs in the country. We tend to measure them in terms of the nature of involvement in the discipline rather than the use of that discipline for broader types of purposes within the society.

In part, it is also this failure to discuss persuasively higher education's nonvocational benefits that leads many to assume its benefit begins and ends with entry into work. And this truncated view has financing implications. The cost of higher education is high, but not so high when measured against many other lifetime purchases. Investment in a home is usually greater; orthodontia may be as expensive; a three week vacation in New York City would probably be about as expensive as one term in college. But we have only begun to think of higher education as a lifetime purchase. It is, in fact, still one of the few major personal expenditures in which we expect to compress the payment period into a very brief time. Loan programs are changing this somewhat, but for many, the willingness to view higher education as a lifetime investment still remains to be developed. This can be accomplished only with better understanding of its multiple benefits.

I was on a panel not long ago with a higher education leader who indicated that we are never called upon to justify and explain the outcomes of the important things in life like love and friendship, and he believes that higher education should be viewed similarly. Who could talk about love, friendship and religion in terms of effectiveness or measurable benefits? And, of course, this is true. It would be comfortable if education could be viewed in the same way. Unfortunately it is not possible. No one is asking for public subsidies for love, friendship and religion. If we were, I think we would soon need assessments of even these endeavors. Seeing the value of assessment in higher education is complicated by the sociology of education. Most faculty members are primarily concerned with the substance of their discipline. Many faculty members leave concern with methods of teaching to those who teach in the lower schools. They draw a distinction between these teachers and themselves as faculty and scholars. Schools of Education are frequently viewed by college faculty members as being related to the functions of teachers and not faculty members. Indeed, the faculty members in Schools of Education sometimes behave as though the material of their courses on educational psychology and pedagogical practice has little or nothing to say to them about the way they conduct their classes concerning these topics. Establishing the importance of assessment of educational delivery among persons who see this as outside their sphere of appropriate interest is hard, but not impossible.

Although it is sometimes difficult to establish the need for assessment, it is not the most difficult part of the task. The process of assessment is very complex. In our rush to sell the necessity for it, we must not underestimate the task. The state of the art is primitive and complicated by the fact that most educational activities have multiple and intertwined goals. We tend in such a situation to measure that which is easily measured and do little to explain other outcomes of the educational activity. Because of this, those outside the educational activity get a limited and perhaps misleading view of the objectives of the process. They are probably the most important objectives which we have not yet learned to describe to others.

Research on learning gains resulting from different instructional strategies has also been less than satisfactory. In much of this research we aggregate too early. In our eagerness to come up with generalizations, we look only at comparisons of group performance. We thereby obscure the very thing we are attempting to study--how individuals perform in response to different learning strategies. The promise for greater effectiveness lies in growth of our understanding of individual differences and our ability to aid learners to be receptive to a range of learning styles. In most educational programs, we have done little to increase the ability of students to learn in a variety of circumstances. If we are to develop adults who are able to learn from all their experiences, this attention to expanding receptivity to learning is essential. Any aggregated information does little to accomplish this.

We must find more useful ways to determine effectiveness as an aid to educational planning. Only through careful and systematic evaluation will we know what decisions to make. One key to any system of evaluation is the specificity of goals for the activity. Our ability to develop clear goals may hold the greatest promise for improved evaluation. I will

share with you a quote that I ran across the other day: "What America needs today is a schooling better aware of its aims. Our colleges need to see clearly what it is they are trying to accomplish." That quote isn't from the Guidelines of the Fund. It is from the President's Commission on Higher Education, issued in 1947. It is still very relevant today. Perhaps it is even more relevant today, because in 1947, less than 25 percent of the 18-22 age group went on to college. Today with more than 50 percent of this age group going on to college, it is even more important that the educational mission of an institution be clearly visible to students and to the public. As we channel more educational funds through students, it becomes essential that students be provided information on the approach and purposes of educational programs so that they may choose those institutions having both programs and learning approaches suited to their needs.

I realize that by emphasizing the key role for evaluation in educational change, I am accepting the dual standard which exists in our educational enterprise. This is not unusual. We are pretty certain that we must have ways of evaluating effectiveness of new and experimental programs. At some stage, we require it. Even before launching a new program, funding agencies require some statements about the value of the experiment. We do not usually need to demonstrate, however, the effectiveness of programs already established. It must be that we assume since it existed for some time, it must be effective. The greatest potential for improved effectiveness, however, might well come as a result of evaluating present as well as new programs for similar outcomes. We should not assess new programs totally in terms of new measures or the old programs totally in terms of old measures, but cross-test both the old and new in terms of the outcomes hoped from both the new and the old programs. Only by such an approach will we know not only what we are gaining but also what we are losing. If we require assessment of new programs, then we ought to measure with the same degree of precision the effectiveness of old programs which the new programs are supposedly replacing. We have not required that in many of our institutions. We have required only that the new prove themselves and that the old simply continue.

As we move toward more useful techniques of evaluating educational programs, I believe that evaluation approaches for individual student progress will change markedly. New procedures will be much more integrated with the educational activity itself. It will, in fact, become a learning strategy itself, one that aids the student primarily instead of being used primarily as a sorting device. Our system of evaluating student progress has provided little information on effectiveness of different programs. We have spent our energies and our time in comparing students with each other rather than in comparing results of different educational approaches. When we shift this focus, we will develop a new and vital capacity for educational planning.

V. AN ARRAY OF WORKING STRATEGIES

College IV: A New Undergraduate Model

by

Robert J. Toft, Dean of College IV,
Grand Valley State Colleges (Michigan)

Objectives and Strategies

The major objective of College IV is to provide high quality undergraduate education readily accessible to a broad range of students without the usual restrictions of time, space, or competition. The strategies employed include the use of small credit-bearing autoinstructional learning modules, coupled with variable-credit individualized learning contracts. The course structure has been eliminated, as has the traditional time line. All learning units are self-paced and registration can take place at any time. Students may start and complete their work at their own convenience. The grading system is replaced with a mastery and competence-based set of criteria. The content of each learning unit is held constant with time being the variable.

Faculty and advanced undergraduate students are employed as module developers, tutors, and determiners of mastery and competence. There are no scheduled meetings, and students are tutored and tested on demand.

Methods and Procedures

Two key terms here are "accountability" and "value-added." A computer-managed instructional system tells students exactly where they are in their educational programs. It records all significant faculty activity and allows for the assignment of faculty to teaching, curriculum development, administrative chores, and so on. Through the development of autoinstructional learning modules the college is producing a capital investment that will allow the use of both professionals and paraprofessionals in the tutoring and testing function.

Through a self-paced, time-free system, College IV provides access to a large group of voters and taxpayers previously disenfranchised because of scheduling difficulties. Thus, firemen on split shifts, traveling salesmen, and prison inmates all become potential students. This increase in access to a large, new segment of the population has a substantial potential value for the college.

The use of mastery learning in place of a distributive grading system adds another dimension of increased competence to those completing the work.

Through the use of diagnostic tests with point remediation and credit-by-examination, it is possible to use the small credit-bearing learning modules to fill in specific deficiencies at the same time the student is progressing along other avenues of full-time study.

By a combination of lecture methods, tutorials, seminars, field experiences, and autoinstructional modular study, many more students may adopt learning strategies to fit their needs and interests.

Outcomes

Results after one full year of operation indicate a nontraditional student body covering an age spectrum of 16 to 67 years. Self-motivation is the primary problem for most students. The time-free system has provided access for many students who would otherwise not have been able to attend any college. A mobile unit carrying curriculum, audiovisual materials, and faculty counseling and advising, has been purchased and will travel throughout the three-county area served by the college. Outreach includes seniors studying in their high schools, inmates in the county jail, nursing home patients, and blue collar workers in a local manufacturing plant. The average College IV student (if one exists) is completing work at approximately one-fifth the rate of average full-time resident college students.

Background

College IV developed out of a serious reading of the first Newman report and several Carnegie Commission reports, including the one entitled, Less Time, More Options. A year of planning preceded the opening of the college. The total instructional budget for the college is supported by state funds. Federal funds were obtained for three summer faculty writing workshops to develop the modular curriculum. All of the modules being produced are available for sale to interested faculty in other institutions.

Increasing Institutional Performance through Faculty Development:

A Three-year Experiment Sponsored by
the College Center of the Finger Lakes

by
Dr. Gary H. Quehl
Executive Director

Improving Institutional Performance

American postsecondary educational institutions have become increasingly concerned with improving their performance as they face the harsh realities of decreased funding, steady or declining enrollment, and declining faculty mobility, together with demands for accountability voiced by students, parents, and state and federal government officials. Past approaches to institutional change (for example, change the curriculum, get brighter students, recruit Ph.D.'s from the best graduate schools, establish a new governance system, undertake comprehensive self-study and planning) have fallen short of meeting these new challenges.

In recent years, a small number of colleges and universities have begun working with another strategy for increasing institutional performance: improved instruction through faculty development. Their programs range from new faculty orientation to one year sabbaticals, from student classroom evaluation to the introduction of new instructional methodologies. In almost all instances, the term "faculty development" refers to a widely accepted and usually fashionable cluster of attitudes and values about teaching that can be summarized in three propositions: 1) teaching is often neglected by and is rarely a serious concern in the training of college faculty; 2) teaching is an important aspect of a college faculty member's professional role; 3) teaching can and must be improved.

A major shortcoming of this growing movement is that the programs created in its name tend to focus on the faculty member as a teacher (instructional development) while ignoring other faculty roles that effect instruction: as persons (personal development) and as organization members (organizational development). Another shortcoming is that faculty development programs generally neglect implications for student and administrative development.

A Model for Increasing Institutional Performance through Faculty Development

During its 13 years of operation, the College Center of the Finger Lakes (CCFL) has evolved from a modest cooperative association to a

mature collegial union that derives significant annual human commitment and financial resources from its member colleges.* On behalf of member colleges, the CCFL central office is authorized to operate ten major co-operative programs that function at the heart of these institutions. One of these is the Faculty Development Experiment.

The model for increasing institutional effectiveness is based on the assumption that faculty development, from a comprehensive perspective, is the most promising place to put the fulcrum. That is, the best way to improve institutional performance is to begin with the faculty but to anticipate and plan for all consequences. The 1960s and early 1970s abound with change efforts that focus on students as learners (for example, remedial education programs) or on administrators as managers (for example, management training for top administrators), but nowhere is there a comprehensive and systematic change program that pays more than lip service to the complex, multiple roles and dynamic phenomenon of an educational institution.

Goals of the Program. Goals in the following three areas were tested initially during the academic year 1973-74 and will guide our program efforts throughout and beyond the next three years:

1. Professional Development. The goals associated with this aspect are: to develop faculty competencies in responding to a variety of student learning styles by choosing appropriately from among a wide range of educational activities; to facilitate development of more clearly defined individual educational philosophies and values; and to increase faculty members' ability to evaluate the effects of their own teaching. Furthermore, each faculty member will become more competent in providing help to other faculty, both inside and outside his own institution and will have ready access to information about available educational resources.
2. Organizational Development. In support of newly acquired faculty competencies, each institution will develop a climate that facilitates both risk-taking and cooperative behavior. Members of the institution will develop greater competencies in the collection, dissemination, and use of information about organizational structures, management, and development and about the functioning of their own institutions. This component of the program will enable

* Full member institutions include Alfred University, Cazenovia College, Elmira College, and Hartwick College. Colleges and universities in New York State that currently contract with the CCFL for specific program services include Eisenhower College, Finch College, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Houghton College, Ithaca College, LeMoyne College, Saint Bonaventure University, SUNY/Brockport, SUNY/Oswego, Syracuse University, and Wells College. The CCFL also has contractual affiliations with Cornell College (Iowa) and the Central Pennsylvania Consortium.

participants to design and implement such organizational processes as improved decision-making and conflict-management procedures to move the institution toward achievement of significant goals related to instructional effectiveness. Finally, the structures of the institution (roles, curriculum, incentive systems, and so on) will be compatible with and supportive of instructional innovations and experiments.

3. Personal Development. The attitudes, values, and personal skills of individuals within the institution also will be compatible with and supportive of increased faculty competencies. These individuals will have a clear sense of both their own personal and professional values and goals and the relationship between personal and institutional values and goals. Furthermore, the institution will provide a climate of support that enables its members to move more easily through critical life transitions and periods of personal stress.

How Goals Are Being Accomplished. A variety of strategies, too complex to describe fully in this paper, are being used to achieve program goals. Briefly, basic components include the following: 1) a series of beginning and advanced instructional improvement workshops, varying in theme and length; 2) consultation with key campus administrators on a regular basis; 3) consultation and training skills workshops aimed at providing faculty, students, and administrative officers personal, organizational, and professional development skills; 4) development of a network of institutional and interinstitutional consulting and training services drawing on these new human resources; 5) campus action research projects focusing on institutional processes, structures, and attitudes as these influence instructional performance; 6) personal growth and interpersonal skills workshops; 7) organizational and management development training; and 8) information dissemination through a quarterly newsletter and biannual journal.

Outcomes. Already evident, but increasingly to be achieved over the next three years, are the following anticipated results: 1) increased self-esteem of faculty, students, and administrators; 2) improved intra- and intergroup communication; 3) understanding of and commitment to the goals of the organization; 4) new programs and procedures that are responsive to institutional goals as well as the goals of organization members; 5) policies and procedures that help organization members clarify personal and professional goals and assist them in meeting these goals; and 6) widespread use of instructional strategies that are cost-effective and compatible with the goals of the institution and the learning styles of students.

Using the Consortium to Implement the Model

Based on our pilot experience during the current academic year, much has been learned about using the consortium to facilitate faculty development during and beyond the next three years;

Change Agency. While the ultimate objective is to improve the effectiveness of each member college through faculty development, the colleges regard the consortium as the agency in which planning, training, and consulting services must, for a time, take place.

Organizational Neutrality. The rigidities and political constraints of institutional life are largely absent when consortium-wide program services are provided through the CCFL central office. In this setting, faculty find they are more open, willing to take personal risks, and learn from each other when dealing with peers outside their formal organizations. The consortium is regarded as a safe place for initial programming, even though the ultimate objective is to enable faculty to function more effectively within their own college.

Efficiency and Economy. The consortium is a fiscally sound means for initiating a long-term faculty development program. The initial three-year costs of the program would be prohibitive for an individual institution but can be partially met through combined funding of the four colleges. This has also made the program attractive to external funding agencies.

The consortium is being used in these three ways to enable each college to move from dependence on central office services and external consultants and trainers to reliance on its own program of home grown expertise in the areas of professional, organizational, and personal development.

Over the next three years, the conversion of CCFL funds and external grant dollars into a wide range of persons who have acquired new skills, attitudes, and values will enable the colleges to use these human resources at very low cost on an institutional and interinstitutional basis. Furthermore, beginning in the summer of 1974 we will be testing the feasibility of establishing the CCFL as a regional center to which colleges and universities can turn for faculty development services. In providing these external service programs, the CCFL will derive an important source of revenue for programming at member colleges after the three-year period is completed.

Other Implications

Although this paper has briefly described the philosophy and program of the College Center of the Finger Lakes, the basic faculty development described herein will be tested and refined in three distinct regional settings: 1) private liberal arts colleges - the CCFL; 2) public community colleges - the Mountain States Association of Community Colleges sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE); and 3) a public university - Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU).

In addition to local coordination within each region, the testing and refinement of this model will be supervised by a Program Development and Evaluation Committee, consisting of Dr. William H. Bergquist (WICHE),

Dr. John F. Noonan (VCU), and Dr. Gary H. Quehl (CCFL), plus external consultants who will monitor the design and implementation of the program's evaluation. This committee is also charged with disseminating information about the program to the postsecondary education community through newsletters, a handbook on faculty development, learning packets on various phases of the program, interim reports, and regional and national conferences.

It is believed that our coordinated efforts will have considerable direct benefits for both participating institutions and other colleges and universities across the country that wish to improve their performance.

Innovation and Improvement in The California
State University and Colleges

by

Dr. David E. Leveille
Associate State University Dean
New Program Development and Evaluation
Office of the Chancellor
California State University and Colleges

The Program for Innovation and Improvement in the Instructional Process in The California State University and Colleges had its origins in the "New Approach" statement of Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke in January, 1971. Based upon a plan for action developed in the fall of 1971, the the State Support Budget for 1972-73 provided a special line item for the program totaling some \$1.4 million, later supplemented by additional faculty positions used for innovative instructional activities. The program was continued in 1973-74 at a level of \$1.28 million. For 1974-75, \$1.4 million is provided, including administrative costs and supplemented by \$134,250 within the general instructional budget for system activities related to credit-by-examination.

Within the Chancellor's office, a Division of New Program Development and Evaluation was established and assigned responsibility for the ongoing function of administering not only programs carried on through the special state funds but also to coordinate Carnegie-funded projects and to pursue the development and installation of other new programs within the system.

The initial, primary objective for the program was to identify, test, and evaluate significant innovations in the instructional process that would lead to increased efficiencies in student learning, qualitative improvement in instruction without significant net cost increases, and greater student and faculty satisfaction with the higher education process.

The method chosen for meeting the primary objective of the program was a systemwide, competitive grant program open to all faculty. This grant program resulted in 54 projects funded in 1972-73 (one project was later cancelled), and 44 projects in 1973-74, including 21 new projects and 23 renewals. The great majority of these projects were single, campus-based projects.

Higher education, just as with any large social organization, is slow to change. Faculty, even those who understand and appreciate different modes of instruction, are more comfortable with the instructional methods by which they have been taught. When they wish to try something new, special support may be needed. Often students are unfamiliar with ways of learning that do not depend solely on the classroom situation. Fiscal and other management procedures have developed within the framework of past methods and approaches, thus compounding the effort required to accomplish change.

In an effort to extend and encourage change, particular emphasis has been placed on informing and stimulating faculty innovators. During the three years of the program, some 300 faculty have been directly engaged in innovative projects, either as project directors or active project associates. In 1973-74 alone, an estimated 750 faculty participated in workshops and conferences sponsored as systemwide activities of the Program for Innovation, or as a part of a particular project. Future Talk, a newsletter designed to increase interest and curiosity about new approaches to learning, has been published for two years and distributed to each of the system's 17,000 faculty. Two films, prepared in 1973-74 and featuring selected California State University and Colleges (CSUC) projects, have been shown to faculty groups both large and small throughout the system. Formal evaluative and summary reports have been prepared on the program as a whole in 1973-74. A series of monographs developed from pilot project final reports has been launched. The CSUC program has been featured in a national publication for planners; presentations about the program have been included in both state and national meetings of faculty and administrators.

Great progress has been made within the CSUC system for developing a climate for dynamic change in the face of a limited growth situation. The California State Legislature and the Executive have been strongly supportive, as have external groups. The Carnegie Corporation provided a grant in 1971 on the promise for planned change within the system. Recently, the federal fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education gave recognition to system accomplishments, as well as continued promise, in a major grant to support faculty development programs in which innovation in instructional methods will play an important part. Smaller special purpose grants have been received from the Danforth and Sloan Foundations as well.

It is clear that if the system is to maintain the momentum that has developed and if proved instructional and instructionally related innovations are to be extended throughout the system, continued special fiscal recognition is required from the State of California.

The primary mission of The California State University and Colleges is instruction. It is altogether appropriate that the greatest emphasis be placed on improving the system's ability to implement programs to provide sound, alternative modes of instruction. At the same time, it is recognized that the system itself must begin to reallocate resources as are appropriate to adjust to new approaches. Further, as our programs have national importance, other external sources of support can be identified.

Regional Assistance to Advance Reform
in Undergraduate Education

by

William R. O'Connell, Jr.

Director

Undergraduate Education Reform Project
Southern Regional Education Board

Introduction

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), through the Undergraduate Education Reform Project, has increased its activities to stimulate new directions in higher education. The purpose of the project is to provide assistance and information for developing nontraditional approaches in undergraduate education and to promote desirable changes in Southern colleges and universities to better serve traditional as well as nontraditional students.

A major purpose of these activities is to help institutions of the South find ways to make constructive changes within the context of their purposes and goals, through the best use of resources available to them and through the joint use of interinstitutional cooperation whenever possible.

Main Objectives of the Program

Specific objectives of this regional program are:

1. To develop an increased willingness on the part of faculty members and higher education officials to reexamine undergraduate education and consider ways to better serve a more diverse population at times, in places, and with methods that have not been traditional.
2. To provide a greater number of sound options for formal study that can lead to baccalaureate degrees or meet individual desires for continued learning throughout life.
3. To stimulate more rapid and more thorough reform as a result of interinstitutional sharing and the involvement of whole state systems.
4. To generate plans for additional regional efforts to determine new ways of strengthening undergraduate education.

Activities to accomplish these objectives fall in four areas: identifying new and nontraditional approaches to undergraduate education in the region and the nation; analyzing these and other innovative programs and proposed revisions in undergraduate curricula; disseminating information about new developments; assisting states and institutions to examine, assess, and implement reforms at the undergraduate level.

Identifying New and Nontraditional Approaches. Project staff visit programs, observe activities, interview key people, and collect reports of relevant programs in and outside the region to gain a thorough understanding of the components, variations, and results of specific experiments. Nontraditional approaches already underway, which the staff are studying, include: articulation agreements between community colleges and senior institutions, the external degree, the time-shortened and time-variable degrees, the competency-based curriculum, contract learning, off-campus or experiential learning, independent study, various calendar revisions, and programs of in-service training for faculty orientation to nontraditional students and approaches.

Analyzing Innovative Programs. Mutual interest or cooperative work groups have been formed on 1) competency-based curricula in general programs, 2) articulation and student transfer, 3) new approaches to instruction, and 4) nonresidential degree programs. These groups have been established for the purpose of 1) advising the project on the best ways to stimulate more individuals and institutions in this particular direction, 2) providing the kind of assistance institutions need in a specific area, 3) helping organize conferences or workshops for regional institutions, 4) serving as consultants and resource persons to institutions in the specified area of interest. Members of these work groups have developed an expertise in specific areas, thereby providing a corps of consultants within the region to be available as needed by institutions and systems.

Disseminating Information. The project serves a clearinghouse function in order to coordinate efforts and provide information to institutions with similar interests. Experiments frequently begin without full recognition of the extent to which some small change may force a broad rethinking of the total educational program. Also, experimentation often is undertaken in isolation, without awareness of similar revisions underway or planned elsewhere. As a result, there is often a failure to share relevant ideas and experiences, a general lack of coordination and unnecessary duplication of effort.

Information about new developments is disseminated through news stories, reports, and publications and through regional or subregional conferences on outstanding examples of reform in all parts of the country. Moreover, as national programs or projects deal with issues of concern to regional institutions or systems, the project works to get representatives of this region involved.

Recently the project held a conference to explore problems and issues in institutional articulation and student transfer and another to help institutions explore concepts and issues in the development of a competency-based curriculum. Participants from several institutions were assisted to attend a national conference on personalized systems of instruction and a regional conference on the development of self-instructional materials. Most of those who attended the conferences on instructional developments have begun to influence new methods in their own academic departments.

Assisting States and Institutions. The project strategy is to stimulate institutions to examine programs, review innovative approaches being introduced elsewhere, and design and implement reforms appropriate to the needs of their constituents and in keeping with institutional goals and purposes. Many institutions have joined in on work with the regional project to accomplish goals and purposes that each institution sets for itself. In every case some institutional commitment has been made. It may be some limited released time for certain faculty and/or administrators and generally some cost sharing for participation.

Background

This project builds on many years of work by the SREB to develop regional cooperation and interinstitutional sharing for improving undergraduate education. The SREB has published monographs on faculty recruitment and retention, curriculum reform, and improvement of teaching. Its Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity has given major attention to encouraging and supporting curriculum reform in black colleges. In recent legislative conferences, governors' conferences, and annual board meetings, the SREB has directed attention to current reassessments of higher education and to proposals for structural and academic reforms. The SREB has also developed and administered a successful experiential learning program for hundreds of student interns across the region, and the public information program frequently calls attention to new directions and reform in higher education.

Recent interest of state government and higher education leaders in new developments and reports of the Carnegie, Newman, and Gould Commissions led to the proposal for this specific project.

Project activities are financed by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation for three years (1973-1976). The project director is William R. O'Connell, Jr.

Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment

by

David Epperson
College of Community Studies
Northwestern University

(summarized by J.N.N.)

Professors in colleges and universities, whatever their work, have been demythologized. The traditional roles, and public perceptions of those roles, have been fragmented, the image shattered. No longer is the professor seen as the gentleman-scholar, the seeker of knowledge, the mentor and guide of aspiring youth. And no longer are there the human satisfactions that once drew talented, dedicated persons into the academic arena--satisfactions from association with colleagues, administrators with authority, and students without it. The reward system in academia has evolved not so much by design as by default, to the point of encouraging the individual professor to view himself and be viewed as specialist, not teacher--as scientist, critic, consultant, curator, actor, researcher, but not as teacher.

The Group for Human Development in Higher Education was brought together first during the sixties by the Hazen Foundation for work on The Student in Higher Education. Subsequently, it turned its attention to the faculty as the major human resource in the enterprise and collaborated on Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment. The project was assisted by the Danforth Foundation, was published recently by Change magazine, and has been widely distributed with help from the Hazen Foundation. Members of the group, although few in number, are major figures in the academic world: Andrew Greeley, Joseph Katz, Joseph Kauffman, Alexander Astin, Craig Comstock, and David Epperson.

Solutions offered by the group to woes of disenchantment, virulent competitiveness, ennui, and jaded intellect--and, for many, a feeling of being not only impotent but trapped--lie in efforts to change the reward system, to reorder priorities in faculty culture and, eventually, in public perceptions of the profession itself. The necessary precondition is that only a small percentage of every faculty member's time be reallocated to efforts and activities now largely neglected. The overall cost should be negligible since these strategies for change were conceived and designed to work in a period of severe financial retrenchment. Indeed, financial woes have catalyzed the very self-searching and insights that now become resources for a quiet academic revolution.

The report puts forward seven concrete recommendations. Summarizing them is difficult and dangerous, since each is related to a carefully constructed analysis of particular problems, but it must be done for purposes of this short article.

1. Colleges and universities should organize regular campus programs on teaching, coordinated by an institute, supported out of the general budget, and sustained primarily by faculty themselves,

using roughly ten percent of their professional time for activities they now neglect.

2. Universities bear a responsibility both for their own teaching of undergraduates and for the later teaching of those to whom they award higher degrees. Therefore, the campus institute should supervise a teaching practicum undertaken by graduate students in the course of their work for the Ph.D. or other degrees that lead to work in college teaching.
3. Graduate students should be able to have their teaching officially evaluated for the record by methods that aim to be as sophisticated as those used to judge their scholarship. Teaching should be judged by a variety of observers who would produce not a grade but a statement of mastery.
4. Just as college teachers should have access to separate systems of confidential assessment and official certification of their teaching, so college students should be graded for the record by people other than their own teachers. A system of certification by third parties can free the teaching relationship from the often unacknowledged conflict between the roles of teacher as helper and teacher as judge.
5. Professors should have access to small grants for special teaching projects.
6. Institutions should loosen the present monopoly departments now hold over both professorial time and fields of knowledge. Alongside the departmental structure, institutions could encourage the development of colleague groups devoted, like departments, to teaching as well as research. In this system, a given professor would have a multiple identity, as both a political scientist and a member of a colleague group on the allocation of world resources.
7. In mid-career some professors develop nonacademic ambitions, want to switch to another field within academic life, or become disinterested in teaching. In order to allow them seriously to consider changing careers, we need a system of insurance for mid-career changes that is open to all colleges and universities.

Epperson and colleagues at Northwestern have developed a proposal for establishing interdisciplinary teaching groups in an effort to implement recommendation number 6. Since it is intended to begin in the fall of 1974, it is too early to report on success or failure. Information on progress may be requested from David Epperson at Northwestern University.

The recommendations above, if implemented, will produce profound change in reward systems of all institutions, undergraduate and graduate. They amount to a clear call for a new kind of academic revolution. Because they are so serious, the recommendations should not be noted "on-the-run," summarized, and abstracted from their context. The total report is short, less than 100 pages, and should be studied in its entirety lest injustice be done to the report as well as to the faculty it intends to help.

Some Strategies Involving
Institutional Self-Study

by

Eldon Park, Director
Institutional Research Program
for Higher Education
Educational Testing Service (Princeton)

Steady state economics is the new fact of life for higher education. In some instances, contraction is viewed with favor. For most colleges and universities, however, the necessary task is one of facing new realities. In order to do this, a new emphasis on planning has been required, along with an examination of the basic goals of the institution. The importance of this latter step is related to the scarcity of resources: limited funds necessitate different priority decisions. If a college is to work through this kind of planning, involvement of the faculty is essential. One strategy for beginning this complex process is the use of the Institutional Goals Inventory, a new self-study and planning tool developed by ETS College and University Programs.

Main Features of the Program

Objectives and Description. The Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) was designed for colleges and universities to help them define their educational goals, establish priorities among those goals, and give direction to their present and future planning. The IGI consists of a series of 90 statements of possible institutional goals. Respondents indicate their views of these goals on a five-point scale ranging from "Of No Importance" to "Of Extremely High Importance" both as they exist on campus (Is) and as the respondents would like them to exist (Should Be). Most of the goal statements refer to outcome goals or substantive objectives colleges may seek to achieve (for example, qualities of graduating students, research emphases, and kinds of public service). The remainder of the statements relate to process or support goals dealing with campus climate and the educational process.

On the IGI Summary Data Report sent to colleges, 80 of the goal statements are grouped into the following 20 goal areas:

Outcome Goals

Academic Development	Vocational Preparation
Intellectual Orientation	Advanced Training
Individual Personal Development	Research
Humanism/Altruism	Meeting Local Needs
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	Public Service
Traditional Religiousness	Social Egalitarianism
Social Criticism/Activism	

Process Goals

Freedom	Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment
Democratic Governance	Innovation
Community	Off-Campus Learning
Accountability/Efficiency	

Responses to ten additional goal statements are tabulated and reported but are not included in the goal areas.

Space is provided in IGI questionnaire booklets for responses to 20 goal statements written locally by each college or university so that institutions can evaluate their own special goals.

The IGI does not tell institutions what their goals are or how to reach desired goals; it provides a means by which individuals and groups can contribute their thoughts about them. Summaries of these thoughts can then serve as a basis for reasoned deliberation toward final definition of college goals.

Strategy. The use of an instrument such as the IGI is by no means the most important aspect of the self-study and planning strategy. It is true that the IGI enables widespread involvement in the planning process, but it is the quality of that involvement that matters most. There should be extensive preparation of the participants in the study before the collection of data. Of even greater importance are dissemination and follow-up activities. It is through all of these activities that the full intent of the planning process can be communicated to those concerned. Students, administrators, alumni, members of the community, and faculty can respond to the IGI, but we would argue that the problems that many institutions are facing require an ongoing participation in the planning process. Planning and priority decisions are difficult at best, and participation in planning enables the process to be both educational and responsive. The use of the IGI can facilitate the constructive participation of these various audiences.

In analyzing IGI results, careful attention will generally be given to those goals now considered very important as well as to those that should be of high importance. A third dimension is the discrepancy between the current importance of particular goals and the preferred importance of those same goals. If there is a small discrepancy, no basic change in the direction of current efforts will be required. If there is a considerable discrepancy between current and preferred importance, then there will need to be further consideration of the consequences of what such a shift in importance will mean. In some cases, only a change in attitude will be required to make the change; in others, shifting the importance of a goal will affect the allocation of human, fiscal, or physical resources of the college.

As can be seen from this very general discussion, the analysis of goals should be an integral part of the planning process, but not an end in itself. Acquiring information about goals from the points of view of the several campus constituencies, however, will establish the

importance of planning and increase the possibility that plans will become reality.

Results so far. The Institutional Goals Inventory was introduced in 1972 and has been used since that time at over 250 colleges and universities for such purposes as accreditation, self-studies, and long-range planning activities. In addition to use by individual institutions, there have been major goal studies involving state systems of higher education. In California a study included some 26,000 people (faculty, administrators, students, local citizens, legislators, and trustees) at 116 universities, colleges, and community colleges. In Montana approximately 3,000 people at 11 campuses across the state responded to the IGI in a study conducted by the Montana Commission on Postsecondary Education.

Further information about the Institutional Goals Inventory and its use in self-study and planning can be obtained by contacting Eldon Park, ETS College and University Programs, Box 2813, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.